

National Collegiate Athletic Association

1987 Convention

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIFORNIA

Proceedings



81st Annual Convention

January 6-10, 1987

San Diego, California

Proceedings

of the

81st Annual Convention

of the

National Collegiate
Athletic Association

Town and Country Hotel
San Diego, California
January 6-10, 1987



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

Nall Avenue at 63rd Street
P.O. Box 1906
Mission, Kansas 66201
913/384-3220
April 1987

NCAA, NCAA seal, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.

Table of Contents

I. Register 1987	
Administrative Organization	7
Convention Delegates, Visitors and Working Media	24
II. Proceedings of the 81st NCAA Convention	
Opening Business Session	47
Opening Remarks	47
Convention Committees	48
Report of Council	49
Report of Memorial Resolutions Committee	51
Honors Luncheon	54
Division I-A Business Session	72
Report of Presidents Commission	73
Proposed Amendments	77
Financial Aid	77
Review of Proposed Amendments	78
Presidents Commission Grouping	78
Academics	81
Division I-AA Business Session	85
Report of Presidents Commission	85
Review of Proposed Amendments	92
Recruiting	92
Proposed Amendments	98
Maximum Awards—Division I-AA Football	98
Review of Proposed Amendments	98
Presidents Commission Grouping	98
Academics	100
Recruiting	100
Financial Aid	100
Eligibility	100
Division I-AAA Business Session	105
Division II Business Session	107
Report of Presidents Commission	107
Review of Proposed Amendments	109
Consent Package—Constitution, Special Rules	109
Consent Package—Bylaw, Others	109
Presidents Commission Grouping	111
Proposed Amendments	119
Eligibility—Initial Qualifier	120
Review of Proposed Amendments	130
Academics	130
Recruiting	131
Proposed Amendments	131
Letter of Intent—Women's Basketball	131
Football Recruiting	131
Review of Proposed Amendments	132
Recruiting	132
Proposed Amendments	132
Tryouts	132

Continuation of Division II Business Session	134
Review of Proposed Amendments	134
Financial Aid	134
Amateurism	134
Membership and Classification	136
Proposed Amendments	136
Track and Field	136
Review of Proposed Amendments	136
Championships	136
Practice and Playing Seasons	137
Proposed Amendments	139
Reconsideration of Tryouts	139
Review of Proposed Amendments	139
General	139
Eligibility	140
Proposed Amendments	140
Seasons of Competition	140
Review of Proposed Amendments	142
Eligibility	142
Reports of Committees	142
Division III Business Session	144
Acceptance of Reports	144
Presidents Commission	144
Executive Committee	146
Division III Steering Committee	148
Financial Aid Subcommittee	151
Playing Seasons Subcommittee	152
Nominating Committee	153
Waivers	153
Proposed Amendments	153
Football Recruiting	153
Self-Financed Visits—Division III	153
Academic Honor Awards	154
Limitations on Numbers of Contests	154
Limitations on Numbers of Contests	154
Limitations on Numbers of Contests	156
Review of Proposed Amendments	159
Multidivision Classification	160
Financial Audit	161
Championships Eligibility	161
Four-Sport Sponsorship Requirement	162
Sports Sponsorship Criteria Sanction	164
Division I Business Session	165
Proposed Amendments	165
Recruiting Contacts	165
Academics	166
Bylaw 5-1-(j)—Eligibility	167
Eligibility—Initial Qualifier	168
Initial Qualifier—Outside Participation	168
Eligibility—Initial Qualifier	169
Satisfactory Progress	170

Academic Reporting	174
Recruiting Contacts	174
Letter of Intent—Qualifier	175
Letter of Intent—Women's Basketball	177
Women's Softball Recruiting	177
Self-Financed Visits	177
Division I Criteria	178
Limitations on Numbers of Contests	178
Maximum Awards—Basketball	180
Preseason Practice—Medical Examinations	180
Basketball Coaching Staff	181
Basketball Coaching Staff	181
Basketball Coaching Staff	183
Eligibility	183
Reconsideration of Maximum Awards—	
Division I-AA Football	185
Special Recognition	185
General Business Session	186
Acceptance of Reports	186
Proposed Amendments	186
Consent Package—Constitution, Special Rules	186
Consent Package—Bylaws, Others	186
Football Recruiting and Evaluation Seasons	194
Basketball Recruiting and Evaluation Seasons	198
Coaches Outside Compensation	199
Institutional Endorsements	201
Endorsement Funds	202
Personal Compensation	202
Enforcement—Preliminary Inquiry	203
Enforcement—Prehearing Case Summary	203
Enforcement—Infractions Reports	204
Enforcement—Public Comment	204
Executive Director	205
Financial Audit	205
Financial Audit	206
Recruiting—Basketball Evaluations	207
Evaluation Periods	208
Recruiting—Printed Recruiting Aids	208
Printed Recruiting Aids	208
Tryout Rule—Awards	209
Tryouts	210
Financial Aid Limitation—Research Grant	211
Complimentary Admissions	211
Continuation of General Business Session	214
Proposed Amendments	214
Complimentary Admissions	214
Complimentary Admissions	215
Amateurism—Name or Picture	215
Permissible Expenses—Olympic Festival Tryouts	216
Permissible Expenses—Serious Injury or Death	217
Multidivision Classification	217

Multidivision Classification	222
Four-Sport Sponsorship Requirement	223
Sports Sponsorship Criteria Sanction	227
Resolution: Drug Testing	228
Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships	233
Championships Eligibility	235
Championships Eligibility	235
Reconsideration of Four-Sport Sponsorship Requirement	235
Championships Eligibility	236
Championships Eligibility	237
Limitations on Numbers of Contests	240
Limitations on Numbers of Contests	241
Foreign Basketball Tours	242
Limitations on Numbers of Contests	242
Reconsideration of Letter of Intent— Women's Basketball	242
Reconsideration of Basketball Coaching Staff	243
Interim Actions	245
Infractions Appeals	244
Infractions Appeals	244
Interpretations	244
Resolution: Interpretative Process	248
Postseason Football Contests	248
Eligibility	249
Seasons of Competition	250
Residence Requirement	251
Transfer Rule—Subvarsity Competition	251
Transfer Waiver—Discontinued Sport	252
Transfer Rule—Nonrecruited Student-Athlete	252
Transfer Rule—One-Time Exception	253
Report of Committees	255
III. Appendices	
A. Legislative Proposals	A-1
B. Roll-Call Voting	A-112
C. Convention Committees	A-124
D. NCAA Convention Sites	A-126
E. Past and Present NCAA Officers	A-127
F. Index to Legislative Proposals	A-129

NCAA Administrative Committee

The Administrative Committee includes the NCAA officers (president, secretary-treasurer, division vice-presidents) and the NCAA executive director.

President

JOHN R. DAVIS
Institutional Athletics Representative
Department of Intercollegiate Athletics
Oregon State University
Gill Coliseum
Corvallis, Oregon 97331
(Term Expires January 1987*)

Secretary-Treasurer

WILFORD S. BAILEY
Professor
Auburn University
Office of Intercollegiate Athletics
202 Ramsay Hall
Auburn University, Alabama 36849-3501
(Term Expires January 1987*)

Executive Director

WALTER BYERS
Nall Avenue at 63rd Street
P.O. Box 1906
Mission, Kansas 66201

Division I Vice-President: Lewis A. Cryer, Pacific Coast Athletic Association
(Term Expires January 1987*)

Division II Vice-President: Asa N. Green, Livingston University (Term Expires January 1987*)

Division III Vice-President: Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego (Term Expires January 1988*)

NCAA Council

The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chair and secretary, respectively. The other 44 members of the Council shall include 22 members from Division I (including at least two chief executive officers and at least six women), 11 members from Division II (including at least two chief executive officers and at least three women), and 11 members from Division III (including at least two chief executive officers and at least three women). The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the membership of that division present and voting at the division business session during the annual Convention. [Constitution 5-1.]

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Division I		
<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Victor A. Bubas Commissioner Sun Belt Conference 1408 North Westshore Boulevard Suite 1010 Tampa, Florida 33607	I-AAA (Region 2)	Jan. 1990*
Eugene F. Corrigan Director of Athletics University of Notre Dame ACC Building Juniper Road Notre Dame, Indiana 46556	I-A Independent North (Region 3)	Jan. 1988*
Joan C. Cronan Director of Women's Athletics University of Tennessee 115 Stokely Athletics Center Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-3110	I-A Southeastern Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1987
Lewis A. Cryer, Commissioner Pacific Coast Athletic Association 1700 East Dyer Road, Suite 140 Santa Ana, California 92705	I-A Pacific Coast Athletic Association (Region 4)	Jan. 1987*
Don J. DiJulia, Commissioner Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference One Lafayette Circle Bridgeport, Connecticut 06604	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1988*
Jack V. Doland President McNeese State University Ryan Street Lake Charles, Louisiana 70609	I-AA West (Region 4)	Jan. 1988*
Della Durant Assistant Director of Athletics Pennsylvania State University 204 Recreation Building University Park, Pennsylvania 16802	I-At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 1987
Mikki Flowers Associate Director of Athletics Old Dominion University Hampton Boulevard Norfolk, Virginia 23508	I-AAA (Region 2)	Jan. 1988*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Frederick Hemke Professor of Music Northwestern University School of Music Regenstein Hall Evanston, Illinois 60201	I-A Big Ten Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*
Cecil W. Ingram Director of Athletics Florida State University P.O. Box 2195 Tallahassee, Florida 32316	I-A Independent South (Region 2)	Jan. 1990*
Clayne R. Jensen Dean, College of Physical Education Brigham Young University 212 Richards Building Provo, Utah 84602	I-A Western Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1990*
David L. Maggard Director of Athletics University of California Memorial Stadium Berkeley, California 94720	I-A Pacific-10 Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1988*
G. E. Moran Jr. Director of Athletics Morehead State University Academic-Athletic Center Morehead, Kentucky 40351	I-AA Central (Region 2)	Jan. 1989*
Sondra Norrell-Thomas Executive Assistant to the Vice-President for Student Affairs Howard University Mordecai Johnson Administration Building, Room 201 2400 Sixth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20059	I-At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 1987*
John P. Reardon Jr. Director of Athletics Harvard University 60 John F. Kennedy Street Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138	I-AA East (Region 1)	Jan. 1990*
B. J. Skelton Dean, Admissions and Registration Clemson University 101 Sikes Hall Clemson, South Carolina 29631	I-A Atlantic Coast Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1988

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Vernon M. Smith Director of Athletics University of Toledo 2801 West Bancroft Street Toledo, Ohio 43606	I-A Mid-American Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*
Robert R. Snell Head, Civil Engineering Department Kansas State University Room 119, Seaton Hall Manhattan, Kansas 66506	I-A Big Eight Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1990*
John E. Thomas Chancellor Appalachian State University Boone, North Carolina 28608	I-AA South (Region 2)	Jan. 1989*
Kathleen M. Wear-McNally Assistant Director of Athletics LaSalle University 20th Street and Olney Avenue Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19141	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1990*
Charlotte West Director of Women's Athletics Southern Illinois University Davies Gym, Room 160 Carbondale, Illinois 62901	I-At Large (Region 3)	Jan. 1987
Albert M. Witte Professor of Law University of Arkansas Law School Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701	I-A Southwest Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1989*

Division II

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Louise Albrecht Associate Director of Athletics Southern Connecticut State University 501 Crescent Street New Haven, Connecticut 06515 (Region 1)	Jan. 1988*
Joan Board Coordinator of Women's Athletics Grand Valley State College 187 Fieldhouse Allendale, Michigan 49401 (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Raymond M. Burse President Kentucky State University East Main Street Frankfort, Kentucky 40601 (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*
Rudy Carvajal Director of Athletics California State University 9001 Stockdale Highway Bakersfield, California 93311 (Region 4)	Jan. 1987*
Howard Elwell Director of Athletics Gannon University University Square Erie, Pennsylvania 16541 (Region 1)	Jan. 1989*
Asa N. Green President Livingston University Station 1 Livingston, Alabama 35470 (Region 2)	Jan. 1987*
Elwood N. Shields Director of Athletics Bentley College 450 Beaver Street Waltham, Massachusetts 02254 (Region 1)	Jan. 1990*
Sandra T. Shuler Associate Director of Athletics North Carolina Central University Fayetteville Street Durham, North Carolina 27707 (Region 2)	Jan. 1990*
James R. Spalding Director of Athletics Bellarmine College Newburg Road Louisville, Kentucky 40205 (Region 3)	Jan. 1987*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Ade L. Sponberg Director of Athletics North Dakota State University NDSU Fieldhouse, Box 5600 Fargo, North Dakota 58105-5600 (Region 4)	Jan. 1988*
Richard B. Yoder Director of Athletics West Chester University of Pennsylvania West Chester, Pennsylvania 19383 (Region 1)	Jan. 1988*

Division III

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Mary R. Barrett Associate Director of Athletics University of Massachusetts Harbor Campus Boston, Massachusetts 02125 (Region 1)	Jan. 1990*
Anthony J. Diekema President Calvin College 3201 Burton Street, S.E. Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506 (Region 3)	Jan. 1987*
Robert W. Hatch Department Chair and Director of Athletics Bates College Campus and Central Avenues Lewiston, Maine 04240 (Region 1)	Jan. 1988*
Thomas M. Kinder Director of Athletics; Chair, Physical Education Dept. Bridgewater College East College Street Bridgewater, Virginia 22812 (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*
William A. Marshall Director of Athletics Franklin and Marshall College Box 3003 Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17604-3003 (Region 2)	Jan. 1990*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Mary Jean Mulvaney Chair, Department of Physical Education & Athletics University of Chicago 5640 South University Avenue Chicago, Illinois 60637 (Region 4)	Jan. 1987*
A. P. Perkinson Jr. President St. Andrews Presbyterian College 1700 Dogwood Mile Laurinburg, North Carolina 28352 (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*
Russell J. Poel Professor of Chemistry North Central College 30 North Brainard Street Naperville, Illinois 60566 (Region 4)	Jan. 1988*
Judith M. Sweet Director of Athletics University of California, San Diego S-005 La Jolla, California 92093 (Region 4)	Jan. 1989*
Patricia A. Thompson Director of Athletics Elmira College Administration Building Elmira, New York 14901 (Region 2)	Jan. 1987*
Alvin J. Van Wie Director of Athletics, Chair, Department of Physical Education College of Wooster Wooster, Ohio 44691 (Region 3)	Jan. 1990*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

NCAA Executive Committee

The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members of the Executive Committee. The division vice-presidents automatically are members, and the remaining nine members are elected by the Council for terms of five years. The terms of no more than two of the nine Council-elected members shall expire in any one year. [Constitution 5-2.]

<i>Division</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
I-A	Merrily Dean Baker Director, Women's Athletics University of Minnesota Bierman Building 516 15th Avenue S.E. Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455	Jan. 1987
I-AA	Francis W. Bonner Professor of English Furman University Greenville, South Carolina 29613	Jan. 1987
I-A	Edward E. Bozik Director of Athletics University of Pittsburgh P.O. Box 7436 Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213	Jan. 1990*
I-AA	Marino H. Casern Director of Athletics Southern University Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70813	Jan. 1991*
II	Connie J. Claussen Coordinator, Women's Athletics University of Nebraska, Omaha 60th and Dodge Streets, Fieldhouse 18 Omaha, Nebraska 68182	Jan. 1988*
I VP (I-A)	Lewis A. Cryer Commissioner Pacific Coast Athletic Association 1700 East Dyer Road, Suite 140 Santa Ana, California 92705	Jan. 1987*
III	Royce N. Flippin Jr. Director of Athletics Massachusetts Institute of Technology MIT Branch P.O. Box D Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139	Jan. 1991*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

<i>Division</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
I-AAA	Robert H. Frailey Director of Athletics American University Washington, D.C. 20016	Jan. 1988*
II VP	Asa N. Green President Livingston University Station 1 Livingston, Alabama 35470	Jan. 1987*
I-A	Leanne Grotke Associate Director of Athletics California State University P156, 800 North State College Fullerton, California 92634	Jan. 1990*
I-A	Harvey W. Schiller Commissioner Southeastern Conference 900 Central Bank Building Birmingham, Alabama 35233	Jan. 1989*
III VP	Judith M. Sweet Director of Athletics University of California, San Diego S-005 La Jolla, California 92093	Jan. 1988*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Presidents Commission

The Presidents Commission is elected by a mail vote of the chief executive officers of all member institutions (or selected by the Division I-A conferences). The 44 members shall include 22 who shall represent Division I members, 11 who shall represent Division II members and 11 who shall represent Division III members. At least three women shall be included, preferably one from each division. The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the chief executive officers of that division (or by the Division I-A conferences). The officers of the Presidents Commission are elected from among the members of the Commission by a majority vote of the Commission's members to serve for two years.

	<i>Term as Chair Expires</i>
Commission Chair: John B. Slaughter, University of Maryland, College Park	Jan. 1988*
Division I Chair: I. M. Heyman, University of California, Berkeley	Jan. 1988*
Division II Chair: James W. Cleary, California State University, Northridge	Jan. 1988*
Division III Chair: James J. Whalen, Ithaca College	Jan. 1988*

Division I

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Lattie F. Coor President University of Vermont, Waterman Bldg. Burlington, Vermont 05405	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1990*
Pope A. Duncan President Stetson University De Land, Florida 32720	I-AAA (Region 2)	Jan. 1987*
Edward B. Fort Chancellor North Carolina A&T State University 1601 East Market Street Greensboro, North Carolina 27411	I-AA South (Region 2)	Jan. 1990*
Very Rev. L. Edward Glynn President St. Peter's College Jersey City, New Jersey 07306	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1988*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
I.M. Heyman Chancellor University of California Berkeley, California 94720	I-A Pacific-10 Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1990*
Jeffrey R. Holland President Brigham Young University Provo, Utah 84602	I-A Western Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1989*
Eugene M. Hughes President Northern Arizona University Box 4092 Flagstaff, Arizona 86011	I-AA West (Region 4)	Jan. 1988*
Edward H. Jennings President Ohio State University 190 North Oval Drive Columbus, Ohio 43210	I-A Big Ten Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1988
Noah N. Langdale Jr. President Georgia State University University Plaza Atlanta, Georgia 30303	I-AAA (Region 2)	Jan. 1989*
William E. Lavery President Virginia Polytechnic Institute Blacksburg, Virginia 24061	I-A Independent South (Region 2)	Jan. 1987*
Peter Likins President Lehigh University Alumni Memorial Building 27 Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18015	I-AA East (Region 1)	Jan. 1989*
Martin A. Massengale Chancellor University of Nebraska 308 Administration Building Lincoln, Nebraska 68588	I-A Big Eight Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1987
Stanley E. McCaffrey President University of the Pacific Stockton, California 95211	I-A Pacific Coast Athletic Association (Region 4)	Jan. 1987*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Very Rev. J. Donald Monan President Boston College Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167	I-A Independent North (Region 1)	Jan. 1989*
Stanley G. Rives President Eastern Illinois University Main 103 Charleston, Illinois 61920	I-AA Central (Region 3)	Jan. 1987
Michael Schwartz President Kent State University Kent, Ohio 44242	I-A Mid-American Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*
Otis A. Singletary President University of Kentucky Lexington, Kentucky 40506	I-A Southeastern Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1988*
John B. Slaughter Chancellor University of Maryland Main Administration Building College Park, Maryland 20742	I-A Atlantic Coast Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1990*
Barbara S. Uehling Chancellor University of Missouri 105 Jesse Hall Columbia, Missouri 65211	I-A At-Large (Region 3)	Jan. 1988*
Richard L. Van Horn President University of Houston 4800 Calhoun, 212 E. Houston, Texas 77004	I-A Southwest Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1990*
Walter B. Waetjen President Cleveland State University 1983 East 24th Street Cleveland, Ohio 44115	I-AAA (Region 3)	Jan. 1990*
Walter Washington President Alcorn State University Lorman, Mississippi 39096	I-AA At-Large (Region 4)	Jan. 1989*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Division II		<i>Term Expires</i>
<i>Name, Institution</i>		
Michael J. Adanti President Southern Connecticut State University New Haven, Connecticut 06515 (Region 1)		Jan. 1987
Thomas A. Bond President Clarion University Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214 (Region 1)		Jan. 1990*
James W. Cleary President California State University Northridge, California 91330 (Region 4)		Jan. 1988*
Robert M. Guillot President University of North Alabama Florence, Alabama 35632 (Region 2)		Jan. 1988*
Arend D. Lubbers President Grand Valley State College Allendale, Michigan 49401 (Region 3)		Jan. 1987*
Charles A. Lyons Jr. Chancellor Fayetteville State University Fayetteville, North Carolina 28301 (Region 2)		Jan. 1989*
Paige E. Mulhollan President Wright State University Dayton, Ohio 45435 (Region 3)		Jan. 1990*
William T. O'Hara President Bryant College Smithfield, Rhode Island 02917 (Region 1)		Jan. 1990*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Ladell Payne President Randolph-Macon College Ashland, Virginia 23005 (Region 2)	Jan. 1987*
Margaret R. Preska President Mankato State University P.O. Box 24 Mankato, Minnesota 56001 (Region 3)	Jan. 1988
Del D. Weber Chancellor University of Nebraska Omaha, Nebraska 68182 (Region 4)	Jan. 1989*

Division III

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
James T. Amsler President Salem State College 352 Lafayette Street Salem, Massachusetts 01970 (Region 1)	Jan. 1989*
Rev. William J. Byron President Catholic University Washington, D.C. 20064 (Region 1)	Jan. 1990*
George Drake President Grinnell College P.O. Box 805 Grinnell, Iowa 50112 (Region 4)	Jan. 1989*
Nenah E. Fry President Sweet Briar College Sweet Briar, Virginia 24595 (Region 3)	Jan. 1990*
Richard C. Gilman President Occidental College Los Angeles, California 90041 (Region 4)	Jan. 1987*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Paul Hardin President Drew University Madison, New Jersey 07940 (Region 2)	Jan. 1987*
William A. Kinnison President Wittenberg University P.O. Box 720 Springfield, Ohio 45501 (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*
Dennis O'Brien President University of Rochester 240 Administration Building Wilson Boulevard Rochester, New York 14627 (Region 2)	Jan. 1988*
Kenneth J. Weller President Central College Pella, Iowa 50219 (Region 4)	Jan. 1988*
James J. Whalen President Ithaca College Ithaca, New York 14850 (Region 2)	Jan. 1988*
Cordell Wynn President Stillman College P.O. Drawer 1430 Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35403 (Region 3)	Jan. 1987*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

NCAA National Office

Walter Byers, *Executive Director*

Administration

Ruth M. Berkey, *Assistant Executive Director*

Ursula R. Walsh, *Director of Research and Sports Medicine*

Edward A. Thiebe, *Youth Programs Coordinator*

Frank D. Uryasz, *Assistant Director of Research and Sports Medicine*

Fannie B. Vaughan, *Executive Assistant*

Shirley Whitacre, *Membership Coordinator*

Business

Louis J. Spry, *Controller*

Richard D. Hunter, *Director of Finance*

Frank E. Marshall, *Director of Accounting*

Kelly G. Conway, *Programmer/Analyst*

William C. Foreman, *Building Superintendent*

Lydia L. Sanchez, *Assistant Convention Director*

Donna L. Wells, *Accountant*

Championships

Thomas W. Jernstedt, *Assistant Executive Director*

Patricia E. Bork, *Director of Women's Championships*

Jerry A. Miles, *Director of Men's Championships*

Daniel B. DiEdwardo, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Nancy J. Latimore, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Dennis L. Poppe, *Assistant Director of Championships*

James A. Sheldon, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Cynthia L. Smith, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Betsy G. Stephenson, *Administrative Assistant*

Patricia W. Wall, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Communications

David E. Cawood, *Assistant Executive Director*

James A. Marchiony, *Director of Media Services*

John T. Waters, *Director of Promotion*

James M. Van Valkenburg, *Director of Statistics*

Alfred B. White, *Assistant Director of Communications*

James F. Wright, *Assistant Director of Communications*

Steve Boda Jr., *Associate Director of Statistics*

Richard M. Campbell, *Assistant Statistics Coordinator*

Gary K. Johnson, *Assistant Statistics Coordinator*

Regina L. McNeal, *Production Coordinator*

Ronald Schwartz, *Director, Television News Service*
119 West 57th Street, Suite 1212, New York, N.Y. 10019

Compliance and Enforcement

Stephen R. Morgan, *Assistant Executive Director*

S. David Berst, *Director of Enforcement*

John H. Leavens, *Director of Compliance Services*

David A. Didion, *Assistant Director of Enforcement*

R. Dale Smith, *Assistant Director of Enforcement*

Charles E. Smrt, *Assistant Director of Enforcement*

Karl D. Benson, *Compliance Representative*

Joseph W. Buffington, *Enforcement Representative*

Daniel A. Calandro, *Enforcement Representative*

Melissa L. Conboy, *Enforcement Representative*

Michael L. Barnes, *Enforcement Representative*

Richard R. Hilliard, *Enforcement Representative*

Richard A. Johanningmeier, *Enforcement Representative*

Mark P. Jones, *Enforcement Representative*

Janet M. Justus, *Enforcement Representative*

Robert J. Minnix, *Enforcement Representative*

Betsy J. Mosher, *Compliance Representative*

Stephanie Sivak, *Enforcement Representative*

David V. Thompson, *Compliance Representative*

James G. Worley, *Enforcement Representative*

Legislative Services

William B. Hunt, *Assistant Executive Director*

Richard J. Evrard, *Director of Legislative Services*

L. Douglas Johnson, *Director of Legislative Services*

Daniel T. Dutcher, *Legislative Assistant*

John R. Gerdy, *Legislative Assistant*

Stephen J. Horton, *Legislative Assistant*

Kevin C. Lennon, *Legislative Assistant*

Stephen A. Mallonee, *Legislative Assistant*

Nancy L. Mitchell, *Legislative Assistant*

Carol A. Powell, *Legislative Assistant*

Publishing

Ted C. Tow, *Assistant Executive Director*

Wallace I. Renfro, *Director of Publishing*

Thomas A. Wilson, *Editor-in-Chief, The NCAA News*

Michael V. Earle, *Assistant Director of Publishing*

Timothy J. Lilley, *Managing Editor, The NCAA News*

Maxine R. Alejos, *Circulation Manager*

Lacy Lee Baker, *Publications Editor*

Jack L. Copeland, *Publications Editor*

Michelle A. Pond, *Publications Editor*

Victor M. Royal, *Publications Production Coordinator*

81st ANNUAL CONVENTION DELEGATES AND VISITORS

Active Member Institutions

District 1

American International College: Robert E. Burke, Milton J. Piepul
 Amherst College: Peter J. Gooding
 Assumption College: Francis P. Gurley, Andrew Laska
 Babson College: Laurie Magoon
 Bates College: Robert W. Hatch
 Bentley College: Elwood N. Shields
 Boston College: Mary Miller Carson, William J. Flynn, Rev. J. Donald Monan
 Boston University: Richard G. Fecteau, Averill C. Haines, Charles F. Taylor
 Bowdoin College: Sidney J. Watson
 Brandeis University: Jeffrey W. Cohen, Rod Crafts, Donna Devlin
 Bridgeport, University of: Ann V. Fariss, Francis W. Poisson
 Brown University: John C. Parry, Joan W. Taylor
 Bryant College: Leon A. Drury, William T. O'Hara
 Central Connecticut State University: Henry S. Enck, Lowell D. Lukas, Richard A. McDuffie, Andrea S. Wickerham
 Colby College: Richard J. McGee
 Connecticut, University of: John T. Casteen III, G. Michael Howard, Patricia H. Meiser, John L. Toner
 Connecticut College: Charles Luce
 Curry College: Thomas G. Stephens
 Dartmouth College: Edward Leland, Louise O'Neal
 Eastern Connecticut State University: William P. Holowaty
 Fairfield University: Harold Menninger, Tamma O'Mara, William P. Schimpf
 Fitchburg State College: Elizabeth A. Kruczek
 Framingham State College: Lawrence P. Boyd
 Franklin Pierce College: Richard L. Burns, John J. Cunningham, Bruce Kirsh, Walter R. Peterson
 Hartford, University of: Robert A. Chernak, C. Donald Cook
 Harvard University: Patricia H. Miller, John P. Reardon Jr.
 Holy Cross College: Ronald S. Perry
 Keene State College: Mary V. Conway, Joanne A. Fortunato
 Lowell, University of: James Cizek, Denise Legault
 Maine, University of, Orono: Judy Hakola, Stuart P. Haskell Jr.
 Maine Maritime Academy: William Mottola
 Massachusetts, University of, Amherst: David C. Bischoff, Daniel Ghormley, Elaine Sortino
 Massachusetts, University of, Boston: Mary R. Barrett
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Jane Betts, Royce N. Flippin Jr., Francis C. O'Brien Jr.
 Massachusetts Maritime Academy: Joseph P. Ryan

Merrimack College: Rev. John E. Deegan, Robert M. DeGregorio Jr.
 Middlebury College: G. Thomas Lawson
 Mount Holyoke College: Sharon L. Crow
 New England College: George R. Hamilton
 New Hampshire, University of: Gail A. Bigglestone, Gordon A. Haaland, C. Robert Keesey, Andrew T. Mooradian, Michael O'Neil
 New Haven, University of: Deborah Chin, William M. Leete Jr.
 Nichols College: Karen J. Tropp
 North Adams State College: Robert N. Maust, Joseph Zavattaro
 Northeastern University: Kristin L. Burns, Irwin M. Cohen, Jeanne Rowlands
 Norwich University: Joseph G. Sabol
 Pine Manor College: Gail Parks
 Plymouth State College: Eugene D. Fahey
 Providence College: Helen Bert, Louis A. Lamoriello, Rev. Terrence O'Shaughnessy
 Quinnipiac College: Daniel S. Gooley
 Regis College (Massachusetts): Judith Burling
 Rhode Island, University of: John R. Chuckran, Tom Dougan, Eleanor R. Lemaire, Margaret D. Robb
 Rhode Island College: William M. Baird
 St. Anselm College: Brother Joachim W. Froehlich, Theodore S. Paulauskas
 St. Michael's College: Edward P. Markey
 Salem State College: James T. Amsler, John D. Galaris
 Simmons College: Sheila Brown
 Southeastern Massachusetts University: John R. Brazil, Bruce E. Wheeler
 Southern Connecticut State University: Michael J. Adanti, Louise Albrecht, Raymond W. DeFrancesco, Lawrence E. Fitzgerald, Anthony Martone
 Springfield College: Martin J. Anisman, Frank S. Falcone, Edward S. Steitz
 Suffolk University: James E. Nelson
 Trinity College (Connecticut): Richard J. Hazelton
 Tufts University: Rocco J. Carzo
 U.S. Coast Guard Academy: Capt. James A. Foels
 Vermont, University of: Lattie F. Coor, Richard A. Farnham, Ben R. Forsyth, Sally Guerett, Denis E. Lambert
 Wellesley College: Virginia L. Evans
 Wentworth Institute of Technology: Lee Conrad
 Wesleyan University: John Biddiscombe, Donald M. Russell
 Western Connecticut State University: Paul Pasqualoni
 Western New England College: Eric Geldart
 Westfield State College: F. Paul Bogan
 Wheaton College (Massachusetts): Lynn Miller
 Williams College: Robert R. Peck
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Susan E. Chapman, James P. Culpepper Jr.
 Worcester State College: Robert A. Devlin, James J. Raukel
 Yale University: Barbara N. Chesler, Wayne Edwards, Frank B. Ryan, Stan Wheeler

District 2

Adelphi University: Paul J. Doherty
 Albany, State University of New York: William M. Moore, Barbara J. Palm
 Alfred University: Eugene Castroville
 Allegheny College: Norman A. Sundstrom
 American University: Robert H. Frailey
 Bernard M. Baruch College: William Eng
 Binghamton, State University of New York: Steve Erber, Jessie A. Godfrey, Nell C. Jackson
 Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania: Mary Gardner, Jerrold A. Griffis, Roger B. Sanders
 Brooklyn College: Molly Perdue, Len Roitman
 Bryn Mawr College: Jenepher P. Shillingford
 Bucknell University: Bruce A. Corrie, Rosalyn K. Ewan, Robert A. Latour
 Buffalo State University College: Fred J. Hartrick
 Buffalo, State University of New York: Judith E. Albino, Norman Baker, Elizabeth Dimmick, David J. Hickson, Michael Laipple, Edwin D. Muto
 Cabrini College: James Fitzsimmons
 California University of Pennsylvania: Janice L. McConnell, John Pierce Watkins
 Canisius College: Lillian Levey, Daniel P. Starr
 Carnegie-Mellon University: James E. Banner, Joan E. Maser
 Catholic University: Jone Dowd, Mary Milne, Fred O'Connor
 Cheyney University of Pennsylvania: Andrew Hinson
 Clarion University of Pennsylvania: Dick Besnier, Thomas A. Bond
 Clarkson University: William O'Flaherty
 Colgate University: Frederick H. Dunlap, Elizabeth Eismeier, Braden Houston, Janet Little, V. Martin Scarano
 Columbia University-Barnard College: Alvin R. Paul, Marjorie N. Tversky
 Cornell University: Betsy East, Harold G. Hall III, Laing E. Kennedy
 Cortland State University College: Don R. Kirkendall, Charles O. Warren
 Delaware, University of: John L. Burmeister, Scotty Duncan, Mary Ann Hitchens, Edgar N. Johnson
 Delaware State College: John C. Martin, Luna I. Mishoe
 Delaware Valley College: Alvin J. Wilson
 Dickinson College: Sue A. Daggett
 District of Columbia, University of: Emma J. Best, Tillman R. Sease
 Drew University: Paul Hardin, Maureen T. Horan, Richard E. Szlasa
 Drexel University: John Semanik, Mary F. Semanik
 Duquesne University: Dennis Golden, Eileen B. Livingston
 East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania: Louis M. Marciani, Robert G. Sutton
 Edinboro University of Pennsylvania: James K. McDonald
 Elizabethtown College: D. Kenneth Ober
 Elmira College: Leonard Simons, Patricia A. Thompson
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison: Robert T. Shields, Irving Weiner
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck: Roy Danforth, Robert H. Donaldson, Ann Gulino

Fordham University: Jay McGowan, Francis X. McLaughlin
 Franklin and Marshall College: Linda E. Hopple, William A. Marshall
 Fredonia State University College: Elizabeth Darling
 Gannon University: Howard Elwell
 Geneseo State University College: Robert F. Riedel, Ronald Satryb
 George Mason University: Jack E. Kvancz, Peter E. Millspaugh
 George Washington University: Steve Bilsky, Edward A. Caress, Lynn George
 Georgetown University: Francis X. Rienzo
 Gettysburg College: Robert T. Hulton
 Glassboro State College: Michael Briglia, Joy L. Heritage
 Hampton University: Walter L. Lovett, Oscar L. Prater, P. LaVerne Sweat
 Hartwick College: Kenneth Kutler, Philip S. Wilder Jr.
 Haverford College: Penelope C. Hinckley, Gregory Kannerstein
 Herbert H. Lehman College: Leonard Lief, Raymond F. Salvestrini Jr.
 Hobart and William Smith Colleges: Mary E. Hosking
 Hofstra University: J. Richard Block, Marc K. Dion, Robert M. Getchell, Cindy Lewis, James M. Shuart
 Howard University: William P. Moultrie, Sondra Norrell-Thomas
 Hunter College: Charles Brown
 Indiana University of Pennsylvania: Frank Cignetti, David A. DeCoster, Herman L. Sledzik
 Iona College: Richard Mazzuto
 Ithaca College: Robert C. Deming, Thomas C. Longin, James J. Whalen
 Jersey City State College: Lawrence R. Schiner
 John Jay College of Criminal Justice: Wallace M. Pina
 Juniata College: William F. Berrier
 Kean College: Patricia Hannisch, Hawley C. Waterman
 King's College: John J. Dorish
 Kutztown University of Pennsylvania: Irv Hess, Carol Teske
 La Salle University: Raymond Heath, Arthur L. Hennessy Jr., Robert Mullen, Kathleen M. Wear-McNally
 Lafayette College: Alan W. Childs, Olav B. Kollevoll
 Le Moyne College: Thomas J. Niland Jr.
 Lehigh University: Karen Adams, Peter Likins, John C. Whitehead
 Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania: Charles A. Eberle, Sharon E. Taylor, Craig Dean Willis, Bruce Young
 Long Island University-Brooklyn Center: James Thompson
 Long Island University/C. W. Post Campus: Vincent Salamone
 Loyola College (Maryland): Thomas M. Brennan
 Manhattan College: John J. Powers
 Manhattanville College: Thomas Weingartner
 Mansfield University of Pennsylvania: Bernard S. Sabol
 Marist College: Brian Colleary, Dennis J. Murray
 Maryland, University of, Baltimore County: Rick R. Hartzell, James C. Mohr, Gary Rupert
 Maryland, University of, Eastern Shore: Kirkland J. Hall, Joel C. Mack
 Marywood College: Jane Farr
 Medgar Evers College: Roy Anderson
 Mercyhurst College: John Leisering
 Messiah College: Layton Shoemaker

Millersville University of Pennsylvania: Gene A. Carpenter, Marjorie A. Trout
 Molloy College: Denise Cohen
 Monmouth College (New Jersey): James Colclough, Samuel H. Magill, Joan Martin
 Montclair State College: Anthony R. Kuolt
 Morgan State University: Leonard Braxton, Raymond A. Downs
 Muhlenberg College: Ralph Kirchenheiter
 Nazareth College (New York): William H. Carey
 New Jersey Institute of Technology: Paul C. Hausser
 New Rochelle, College of: Kathleen LeVache
 New York, City College of: Paul Bobb, Richard Zerneck
 New York, Polytechnic Institute of: Joseph G. Martini
 New York Institute of Technology: William T. Lai
 New York Maritime College, State University of: James Migli
 New York University: Daniel E. Quilty
 Niagara University: John W. Gouldrick
 Oneonta State University College: Carol Ann Blazina, Joseph R. Nicolette
 Oswego State University College: Jo Ann Meadows, John L. Spring, Alice Struzinsky
 Pace University: Peter X. Finnerty
 Pennsylvania, University of: Elton Cochran-Fikes, Skip Jarocki, Paul R. Rubincam Jr., Carolyn J. Schlie, James P. Tuppeny
 Pennsylvania State University: John J. Coyle, Della Durant, Richard Lucas, Joseph V. Paterno, Ellen Perry
 Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science: Harry Pure
 Pittsburgh, University of: Dean Billick, John W. Blanton, John O. Bolvin, Edward E. Bozik, Walter P. Cummins, Donna Sanft, Carol J. Sprague
 Pittsburgh, University of, Johnstown: Paul H. Saylor
 Plattsburg State University College: Joanna Davenport
 Potsdam State University College: Conrad A. Bautz, Ronald D. Tallman
 Princeton University: Samuel C. Howell, Robert J. Myslik, Richard G. Williams
 Queens College: Brian DeMasters
 Ramapo College: Richard M. Myrlak
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Robert F. Ducatte
 Rider College: Viola Udy
 Robert Morris College: C. Robert Miller, Robert W. Norberg
 Rochester, University of: John A. Reeves, Peter Regenstreif, Joyce S. Wong
 Rochester Institute of Technology: Charles A. Layne, Louis W. Spiotti
 Rutgers University, New Brunswick: Edward J. Bloustein, Malcolm G. McLaren, Paul Vitek, Joseph P. Whiteside
 Rutgers University, Newark: John K. Adams, Florence A. Labenski, Gene A. Vincenti
 St. Bonaventure University: Lawrence J. Weise
 St. Francis College (New York): Carlo Tramontozzi
 St. Francis College (Pennsylvania): Thomas Iannacone
 St. John's University (New York): George R. Bisacca, John W. Kaiser, Kathleen Meehan
 St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania): Michael L. Schultz
 St. Lawrence University: W. Lawrence Gulick, Robert J. Sheldon

St. Peter's College: Very Rev. L. Edward Glynn, William A. Stein
 Scranton, University of: Gary N. Wodder
 Seton Hall University: Sue Dilley, Laurence C. Keating Jr., John J. Mitchell Jr.
 Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania: Jane Goss, James G. Pribula
 Siena College: William J. Kirsch, Terry J. Reynolds
 Skidmore College: Jane Misurelli
 Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania: Bruce G. Boliver, William C. Lennox
 Southampton Campus of Long Island University: Patricia Lamb Kennedy
 Staten Island, College of: Joseph Barresi
 Stockton State College: George L. James
 Stony Brook, State University of New York: Paul J. Dudzick, Sandra Weeden
 Susquehanna University: Connie Delbugh, Donald Harnum
 Swarthmore College: Eleanor K. Hess
 Syracuse University: David H. Bennett, John J. Crouthamel, Chet Gladchuk, Louis G. Marcoccia, Doris R. Soladay
 Temple University: Eve Atkinson, Charles Theokas
 Thiel College: John A. Dickason
 Towson State University: James E. Ewig, Bill Hunter, Nance Reed, Hoke L. Smith
 Trenton State College: Roy W. Van Ness
 U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: Richardo Brown
 U.S. Military Academy: Teresa M. Doyle, Brig. Gen. Roy K. Flint, Carl F. Ullrich
 U.S. Naval Academy: Capt. John O. Coppedge
 Union College (New York): Richard S. Sakala
 Ursinus College: Adele P. Boyd, Robert R. Davidson
 Utica College: Lansing G. Baker, James A. Spartano
 Vassar College: Lynn C. Bartlett, Richard G. Becker
 Villanova University: Ted Aceto, Mary Anne Dowling
 Wagner College: Walt Hameline
 West Chester University of Pennsylvania: Susan Lubking, Richard B. Yoder
 West Virginia University: Forest J. Bowman, Jon A. Reed, Fred A. Schaus
 Widener University: Bruce Bryde, William B. Manlove Jr.
 William Paterson College: Arthur Eason, Sabrina Grant

District 3

Alabama, University of, at Birmingham: Gerald T. Bird, John D. Jones, Richard L. Miller, J. Dudley Pewitt, Barbara Walker, Don Young
 Alabama, University of, Huntsville: Paul H. Brand
 Alabama, University of, Tuscaloosa: Jimmy Carroll, Sarah Patterson, Richard Thigpen, Joab L. Thomas
 Alabama A&M University: Gene Bright
 Alabama State University: Leon Howard, Jerome Quarterman
 Albany State College (Georgia): Wilburn A. Campbell Jr.
 Appalachian State University: Judy Clarke, Jim Garner, Alan J. Hauser, John E. Thomas
 Armstrong State College: John G. Brewer

Auburn University: Wilford S. Bailey, Joseph S. Boland III, Jane B. Moore,
 Hindman Wall
 Augusta College: Marvin Vanover
 Austin Peay State University: Bob Brooks
 Averett College: Vesa Hiltunen
 Baptist College: W. Howard Bagwell
 Barry University: B. Boyd Benjamin
 Bellarmine College: David P. O'Toole, James R. Spalding
 Benedict College: William F. Gunn Jr.
 Berea College: Joy Hager
 Bethune-Cookman College: Lloyd C. Johnson
 Bowie State College: James E. Lyons
 Bridgewater College (Virginia): Mary Frances Heishman, Thomas M.
 Kinder
 Central Florida, University of: William G. Callarman, Art W. Zeleznik
 Christopher Newport College: R. Bev Vaughan
 Citadel, The: Maj. Gen. James A. Grimsley, Col. William L. Harris, Walt
 Nadzak
 Clemson University: R. Allison Dalton, S. Leanord Gough, Dwight Rainey,
 Robert W. Robinson Jr., B. J. Skelton
 Coastal Carolina College: Andy E. Hendrick, George F. Sasser
 Columbus College: Derek Mann, Robert D. Peterson
 Davidson College: Christopher B. Morris
 Delta State University: Bradford W. Hovious, William M. Jones, Kent
 Wyatt
 Duke University: Tom Butters, Jeffrey H. Potters, John C. Weistart,
 Lorraine Woodyard
 East Carolina University: O. Kenneth Karr, Ernest W. Schwarz, Gene A.
 Templeton
 East Tennessee State University: Charles E. Clark, Janice C. Shelton
 Eastern Kentucky University: Donald G. Combs
 Elizabeth City State University: Thomas L. Caldwell, W. Curtis Williams
 Emory University: Gerald B. Lowrey, James V. McMahon, Sandy Tillman
 Fayetteville State University: Ralph E. Burns, Charles A. Lyons Jr., John
 D. Marshall Jr.
 Ferrum College: Thomas N. Hickman
 Fisk University: Harriet A. Hamilton
 Florida, University of: William Arnsperger, Marshall M. Criser, Jeremy
 N. Foley, Mandell Glicksburg, Ann Marie Lawler, James C. Weaver
 Florida A&M University: Sterlin Adams, Theodore Hemmingway, Sarah
 E. Hill, Nelson E. Townsend
 Florida Atlantic University: Jack G. Mehl, Kenneth M. Michels
 Florida International University: Larry Baldwin, Emily H. Harsh, Arthur
 W. Herriott, David Rice
 Florida Southern College: Lois Webb
 Florida State University: Charles Ehrhardt, Cecil W. Ingram, Bernard F.
 Sliger, Jan Stocker
 Fort Valley State College: Douglas T. Porter
 Frostburg State College: Harold J. Cordts
 Furman University: George Bennett, Francis W. Bonner
 Gallaudet University: Robert H. Westermann, Peg Worthington

Georgia, University of: Dick Bestwick, Vincent J. Dooley, Lee R. Hayley,
 Elizabeth Murphey, William M. Powell, Henry King Stanford
 Georgia Institute of Technology: Henry C. Bourne Jr., Lawton Hydrick,
 Bernadette V. McGlade, James E. Murphy III, Homer C. Rice, William
 M. Sangster
 Georgia Southern College: William H. Bolen, David B. Wagner
 Georgia State University: G. Rankin Cooter, Noah N. Langdale Jr.,
 William S. Patrick
 Greensboro College: Milton E. Reece
 Hampden-Sydney College: Louis F. Miller
 Hollins College: Lynda J. Calkins
 Jacksonville State University: Jerry N. Cole
 Jacksonville University: Donald O. Jacobs, Jesse S. Robertson Jr.
 James Madison University: S. Dean Ehlers, Leotus Morrison, William R.
 Nelson, Russell G. Warren
 Johns Hopkins University: Lucien Brush Jr., Robert H. Scott, Robert S.
 Welch
 Johnson C. Smith University: Horace T. Small
 Kentucky, University of: Kathleen J. DeBoer, Clifford O. Hagan, Robert G.
 Lawson
 Kentucky State University: Raymond M. Burse, William K. Head, Charles
 H. Lambert
 Kentucky Wesleyan College: J. Robert Cockrum
 Lane College: Willie G. Shaw
 Liberty University: Chuck Burch, A. Pierre Guillermin, Allan F.
 Worthington
 Livingston University: Asa N. Green
 Longwood College: Carolyn V. Hodges
 Louisiana State University: John M. Drew, Larry B. Jones, Terry R. Lewis,
 Billy M. Seay, Joe R. Yates
 Louisville, University of: Edward H. Hammond, Burt L. Monroe Jr.,
 William C. Olsen
 Lynchburg College: Jack M. Toms
 Marshall University: David T. Braine, Dorothy E. Hicks
 Mary Baldwin College: Mary Ann Kasselmann
 Mary Washington College: Edward H. Hegmann, Stephen Stageberg
 Maryland, University of, College Park: L. Ray Gillian, Randall G.
 Hoffman, John B. Slaughter, Betty F. Smith, Charles F. Sturtz, Suzanne
 Tyler
 Memphis State University: Thomas G. Carpenter, Charles Cavagnaro,
 Lynn Parkes, Nicholas L. White
 Mercer University: Dan R. Quisenberry
 Methodist College: Thomas Austin
 Miami, University of (Florida): Edward T. Foote II, Sam Jankovich, Harry
 C. Mallios
 Middle Tennessee State University: Jimmy Earle
 Millsaps College: George M. Harmon
 Mississippi, University of: Warner Alford, Thomas C. Meredith, Jeanne
 Taylor, R. Gerald Turner, Max W. Williams
 Mississippi College: John W. Legg, John M. Williams
 Mississippi State University: Charles L. Carr, Bryce Griffis, Donovan D.

Horn, Donald W. Zacharias
 Morehead State University: G. E. Moran Jr.
 Morris Brown College: Greg Thompson
 Murray State University: Mike Dill, Johnny Reagan
 New Orleans, University of: Ronald J. Maestri, Jesse O. Snowden
 Nicholls State University: Donald Ayo, Robert Falgout, Don Landry
 Norfolk State University: Willard Bailey, Iris G. Brown
 North Alabama, University of: Robert M. Guillot, Roy S. Stevens
 North Carolina, University of, Asheville: Edward G. Farrell
 North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill: Richard A. Baddour, Christopher Fordham, Richard G. Hiskey, Arthur Padilla, John D. Swofford
 North Carolina, University of, Charlotte: Judy Rose, Thomas C. Turner
 North Carolina, University of, Greensboro: James H. Allen, Nelson E. Bobb, Fred L. Drake, David B. Knight
 North Carolina, University of, Wilmington: William J. Brooks, David K. Miller, James C. Sabella
 North Carolina A&T State University: Edward B. Fort, Orby Moss Jr., James A. Williams Jr.
 North Carolina Central University: Tyronza R. Richmond, Sandra T. Shuler
 North Carolina State University: Nora Lynn Finch, Richard D. Mochrie, Bruce R. Poulton, Frank Weedon
 North Carolina Wesleyan College: Mike Fox
 Northern Kentucky University: Cynthia S. Dickens, Thomas J. Kearns, Edward L. Thompson
 Old Dominion University: Mikki Flowers, James Jarrett, Melvin H. Williams
 Pembroke State University: Howard Dean, Ray Pennington
 Radford University: Donald N. Dedmon, Chuck Taylor
 Randolph-Macon College: Theodore S. Keller, Ladell Payne
 Rhodes College: Chuck Gordon
 Richmond, University of: Harold W. Babb, Samuel Banks, Charles S. Boone
 Rollins College: Ed Borsoi, Gordon E. Howell
 St. Andrews Presbyterian College: James M. Crabbe
 St. Augustine's College: Wanzo F. Hendrix
 St. Leo College: Norman D. Kaye
 St. Mary's College of Maryland: John H. Harvey
 St. Paul's College: Joseph E. Thompson
 St. Thomas University (Florida): Paul Mainieri
 Samford University: Paul F. Dietzel
 Savannah State College: John H. Myles
 South, University of: Mary Susan Cushman, Willard Huyck
 South Alabama, University of: Joe Gottfried, Jeral Williams
 South Carolina, University of: Robert K. Marcum, William F. Putnam
 South Carolina State College: John T. Bowden Jr., Willis C. Ham, Albert E. Smith
 South Florida, University of: Paul S. Griffin, Stewart W. Schneller
 Southeastern Louisiana University: Bob Butler, Newton Chelette
 Southern Mississippi, University of: Roland H. Dale, Ralph N. Floyd Jr.,

Aubrey Lucas, Bill McLellan, Sidney E. Weatherford
 Stetson University: Pope A. Duncan
 Stillman College: Cordell Wynn
 Sweet Briar College: Bonnie Kestner
 Tampa, University of: Fran Curci, Bruce A. Samson
 Tennessee, University of, Chattanooga: Sharon C. Fanning, Paul J. Watson, Harold B. Wilkes
 Tennessee, University of, Knoxville: Joan C. Cronan, Douglas A. Dickey, Donald Eastman, Malcolm C. McInnis Jr., Philip Scheurer, George R. Woodruff
 Tennessee, University of, Martin: Ernest W. Blythe Jr., Nick Dunagan, William R. Kaler, Ramon A. Mears, Cathy Strange
 Tennessee State University: Bernard G. Crowell
 Tennessee Technological University: Thurston E. Banks, David L. Larimore
 Troy State University: Fred B. Davis, Robert E. Stewart
 Tulane University: Milton Fingerman, Thomas Hill
 Tuskegee University: Howard Davis
 Valdosta State College: Hugh C. Bailey, Joe A. Gore, Tommy J. Thomas
 Vanderbilt University: Paul Harrawood, Charles A. Kiesler, Roy Kramer
 Virginia, University of: Richard D. Schultz, Todd Turner, D. Alan Williams
 Virginia Commonwealth University: Edmund F. Ackell, Steven J. Danish, Elizabeth S. Royster, Richard L. Sander
 Virginia Military Institute: Davis Babb, Eric Hyman, Gen. Sam S. Walker
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute: Jo K. Kafer, James I. Robertson Jr.
 Virginia State University: Leon W. Bey, Paulette Johnson, Rudolph Powell
 Virginia Union University: James F. Battle, William E. Lindsey
 Wake Forest University: Gene E. Hooks, John W. Sawyer
 Washington and Lee University: William D. McHenry
 Washington College: Edward L. Athey
 West Georgia College: Jimmy C. Stokes
 Western Carolina University: Gurney Chambers, Myron L. Coulter, Betty J. Peele, Terry Wanless
 Western Kentucky University: William E. Bivin, Paul B. Cook, Jimmy Feix, Pam Herriford
 Western Maryland College: Carol A. Fritz
 William and Mary, College of: Linda Moulton, John H. Randolph, Paul R. Verkuil, Mildred B. West, Lawrence L. Wiseman
 Winston-Salem State University: Haywood L. Wilson Jr.
 Winthrop College: Robert H. Breakfield, Doug Echols, Martha Kime Piper

District 4

Adrian College: Ron Labadie
 Akron, University of: David H. Adams, Robert Fournier, William V. Muse, Mary Ann Tripodi
 Albion College: Frank Joranko
 Ashland College: Fred M. Martinelli, Robert L. Wendling
 Augsburg College: Joyce Pfaff
 Augustana College (Illinois): John R. Farwell

Aurora University: Sam S. Bedrosian
 Baldwin-Wallace College: Louis A. Barone
 Ball State University: Don Purvis, John Reno, Andrea Seger, George E. Swafford
 Bemidji State University: James L. Richards
 Bowling Green State University: Phil Goldstein, John C. Gregory, Marvin L. Kumler, Kevin McHugh, Paul J. Olscamp
 Butler University: Mary Ann Rohleder, William L. Sylvester
 Calvin College: Anthony J. Diekema, David B. Tuuk, Doris Zuidema
 Capital University: Armin P. Langholz
 Carleton College: Marjorie Mara, William Terriquez, Mylla Urban
 Carroll College: Merle Masonholder
 Carthage College: August R. Schmidt
 Case Western Reserve University: David M. Hutter
 Central Michigan University: David B. Keilitz, Fran Koenig, Douglas W. Nance
 Chicago, University of: Mary Jean Mulvaney, Patrick Palmer, Rosalie Resch, Lorna P. Straus, Greg Warzecka
 Chicago State University: Barbara J. Farnandis, Bruce W. Herron
 Cincinnati, University of: Nancy R. Hamant, Carl R. Meyer, Thurman Owens, Gordon S. Skinner
 Cleveland State University: Robert F. Busbey, Alice J. Khol, Merle Levin, Susan A. MacManus, Walter B. Waetjen
 Concordia College, Moorhead: Armin Piphio
 Dayton, University of: Elaine Dreidame, Thomas J. Frericks, Dennis Gerdeman
 Denison University: Theodore H. Barclay, Andrew G. De Rocco, F. Trevor Gamble, Cheryl A. Marra, Marci McCaulay
 DePaul University: William D. Bradshaw, James Doyle, Jean Lenti Ponsetto
 DePauw University: Robert D. Loring, Thomas A. Mont
 Detroit, University of: Brad Kinsman
 Earlham College: Porter G. Miller
 Eastern Illinois University: R. C. Johnson, Ron Paap, Stanley G. Rives, Robert E. Saltmarsh, Joan K. Schmidt
 Eastern Michigan University: Eugene Smith
 Elmhurst College: Allen F. Ackerman
 Evansville, University of: James A. Byers, J. Robert Knott
 Ferris State College: Thomas G. Cook, Dean Davenport
 Grand Valley State College: Joan Boand, Thomas E. Hendrix, Arend D. Lubbers, George M. MacDonald
 Gustavus Adolphus College: James M. Malmquist
 Hope College: Anne Irwin, Raymond E. Smith
 Illinois, University of, Champaign: Alyce Cheska, Karol A. Kahrs, John E. Koenig, John E. Nowak, Preston L. Ransom, Neale R. Stoner
 Illinois, University of, Chicago: Thomas W. Beckham, Thomas Russo
 Illinois Benedictine College: John T. Ostrowski
 Illinois College: William A. Anderson
 Illinois State University: Robert E. Frederick, Linda Herman, Donna Taylor, Donna Jo Workman
 Indiana University, Bloomington: Ralph N. Floyd, Isabella Hutchison,

Elizabeth Kurpius, Marianne H. Mitchell, Haydn H. Murray, John W. Ryan
 Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne: Donald J. Schmidt
 Indianapolis, University of: Kenneth Borden, William A. Bright
 Iowa, University of: Larry Bruner, Chalmers W. Elliott, Sabrina Ford, Christine H. B. Grant, Linda C. Hackett, W. Fred Mims, Bonnie Slatton
 John Carroll University: Anthony DeCarlo, James M. Lavin
 Kalamazoo College: Robert L. Kent
 Kent State University: Paul V. Amodio, Thomas J. Barber, Judy Devine, John Konstantinos
 Kenyon College: Philip H. Jordan Jr., Perry Lentz, Jeffrey Vennell
 Knox College: Harlan Knosher
 Lake Superior State College: James Fallis, Charles W. Jones, Harry Pike
 Lawrence University: Rich Agness
 Lewis University: Dennis F. Rio, Paul Ruddy
 Loyola University (Illinois): Carolyn Velloso O'Connell, Samuel P. Ramenofsky
 Macalester College: Sheila Brewer
 Marquette University: Carla H. Hay, John D. Ludlow, Henry C. Raymonds, Tat Shiely
 Miami University (Ohio): Darrell Hedric, Harold W. Jasper, Paul G. Pearson, Richard G. Shrider, Karen Womack
 Michigan, University of: Gwendolyn S. Cruzat, Paul W. Gikas M.D., Phyllis M. Ocker, Will Perry, Clifford F. Sjogren, Don Triveline
 Michigan State University: Kathy Lindahl, Gwendolyn Norrell, Douglas W. Weaver
 Michigan Technological University: Ted Kearly
 Millikin University: Merle W. Chapman
 Minnesota, University of, Duluth: Linda M. Larson, Bruce McLeod, Dennis L. Nelson, Richard W. Ojakangas
 Minnesota, University of, Twin Cities: Merrily Dean Baker, Holger Christiansen, Elayne M. Donahue, Paul R. Giel, Jo-Ida Hansen, Donna J. Olson, Mariah Snyder, Robert A. Stein
 Mount Union College: Truman D. Turnquist
 North Central College: Russell J. Poel
 Northern Illinois University: Robert J. Brigham, Jerry A. Ippoliti, John E. La Tourette, Susie Pembroke-Jones, Nancy M. Vedral
 Northern Michigan University: James B. Appleberry, Thomas L. Knauss, Barbara J. Patrick, R. Thomas Peters Jr., Jerry Saundri, John R. Taylor
 Northwestern University: Anne S. Barbour, Frederick Hemke, Ken Kraft, Doug Single
 Notre Dame, University of: Brian Boulac, Eugene F. Corrigan, Rev. Edmund P. Joyce
 Oakland University: Paul E. Hartman, Glenn A. Jackson
 Oberlin College: George Andrews, Mary J. Culhane, Joseph W. Gurtis Jr., Susan Kane, Lawrence Vance
 Ohio Northern University: Janet R. Kittell, Herbert N. Strayer
 Ohio State University: Phyllis Bailey, Richard M. Bay, Laura Blomquist, Edward H. Jennings, James L. Jones, Bill Myles, C. J. Slanicka
 Ohio University: Chuck Higgins, Robert Kline, Harold N. McElhaney, Peggy J. Pruitt

Olivet College: Susan Bujack
Purdue University: Buford H. Byers, Martha O. Chiscon, George S. King Jr., Carol Mertler
Quincy College: Rev. James Toal
Rockford College: William F. Langston
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology: Gene Mitz
Saginaw Valley State College: Robert T. Becker, George W. Eastland Jr.
St. Catherine, College of: L. J. Larson
St. Joseph's College (Indiana): Frederick R. Berger
St. Mary's College (Minnesota): Linda Anderson
St. Norbert College: Albert E. Negratti
St. Thomas, College of (Minnesota): Jo Ann Andregg, Frank Mach
Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: Tim Buell, Pamela C. Gunsten, Cynthia Jones, G. Lynn Lashbrook
Southern Indiana, University of: Donald Bennett, Charles J. Bertram
Toledo, University of: James D. McComas, Vernon M. Smith, John W. Stoepler, Marnie W. Swift
Valparaiso University: Richard P. Koenig, William L. Steinbrecher
Wabash College: Joseph O'Rourke, Lewis S. Salter
Wayne State University (Michigan): Dorothy E. Dreyer, Fred A. Mulhauser, Christ Petrouleas
Western Illinois University: James E. McKinney, Gil Peterson, Helen Smiley, Ralph H. Wagoner
Western Michigan University: Chauncey J. Brinn, Leland Byrd, Christine Hoyles, Leo C. Vander Beek
Wheaton College (Illinois): Tony Ladd, James Mathisen, Jack Swartz
Wisconsin, University of, Eau Claire: Stephen J. Kurth
Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay: Charles Ihrke, David L. Outcalt, Daniel Spielmann
Wisconsin, University of, LaCrosse: Sharlene Peter, E. William Vickroy
Wisconsin, University of, Madison: Otto Breitenbach, Ron Heitzinger, Diane Lindstrom, Kit Saunders, David W. Tarr
Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee: Paul A. Haubrich, Daryl A. Leonard
Wisconsin, University of, Oshkosh: Edward Anderson, Helen H. Briwa, James J. Flood
Wisconsin, University of, Platteville: George Chryst
Wisconsin, University of, Stevens Point: Nancy Page, Virgil Thiesfeld
Wisconsin, University of, Stout: Warren C. Bowlus
Wisconsin, University of, Superior: Richard E. Johnson
Wisconsin, University of, Whitewater: Willie Myers
Wittenberg University: Linda L. Arena, William A. Kinnison, Virginia H. Lucas, Robert E. Rosencrans
Wooster, College of: Gordon Collins, Sheila Noonan, Alvin J. Van Wie
Wright State University: Michael J. Cusack, Paige E. Mulhollan, Gordon L. Wise, Peggy L. Wynkoop
Xavier University (Ohio): Jeffrey H. Fogelson, Art Shriberg
Youngstown State University: Paul M. Dutton, Joseph F. Malmisur, Paul C. Peterson, Pauline N. Saternow

District 5

Augustana College (South Dakota): A. Richard Petersen

Bradley University: Martin G. Abegg, Ron Ferguson, Ron Koperski
Buena Vista College: Mark Peterson
Central College (Iowa): Ronald M. Schipper, Kenneth J. Weller
Central Missouri State University: Philip W. Conn, Ed Elliott, Paul H. Engelmann, Jerry M. Hughes, Peggy E. Martin
Coe College: Robert L. Thurness
Colorado, University of: William H. Baughn, Lynn J. Ellins, C. William Fischer, Robert L. Heiny, Bill Marolt
Cornell College: Jerry Clark
Creighton University: C. Timothy Dickel, Mary Higgins, Don Leahy
Drake University: James A. Adams, Curtis W. Blake, Bob MacKenzie, Betty Miles
Grinnell College: Diane Fairchild
Indiana State University: Alpha Cleary, Bernard F. Cooper, John C. Jessell, Richard G. Landini
Iowa State University: John P. Mahlstede, Charles E. McCandless, Max Urlick
Kansas, University of: Del Brinkman, Gary Hunter, Monte C. Johnson
Kansas State University: William Lee Moon Sr., Robert R. Snell, Larry Travis, Jon Wefald
Lincoln University (Missouri): John A. Freeman
Loras College: Robert Bierie, Michael Budde
Luther College: Betty A. Hoff, Reginald Laursen
Mankato State University: Georgene Brock, Don Buchanan, Joe Farnham, Margaret R. Preska, Ron Wellman
Maryville College (Missouri): Lonnie Folks, David R. Pierce
Missouri, University of, Columbia: Jack Lengyel, Henry T. Lowe
Missouri, University of, Rolla: Rodney A. Schaefer
Missouri, University of, St. Louis: Charles Smith, Fred Wilke
Morningside College: Erv Mondt
Nebraska, University of, Lincoln: Don Bryant, Robert S. Devaney, Barbara A. Hibner, Martin A. Massengale, James O'Hanlon
Nebraska, University of, Omaha: Bobby Thompson, Larry Trussell, Del D. Weber
Nebraska Wesleyan University: Arthur C. Nicolai
North Dakota, University of: Robert Entzion, Kathleen McCann, George W. Schubert
North Dakota State University: Lynn Dorn, David Forbes, Ade L. Sponberg
Northeast Missouri State University: Walter H. Ryle
Northern Colorado, University of: Rosemary Fri, Robert A. Oliver
Northern Iowa, University of: Robert A. Bowlsby, John Conner, John Jermier, Lynn King, Dixon L. Riggs, Steven F. Schmit, Sandra Williamson
Northwest Missouri State University: Virgil Albertini, John P. Mees
Oklahoma, University of: Donnie Duncan, Daniel G. Gibbens, Frank E. Horton
Oklahoma State University: Ann A. Baer, Gerald M. Lage, Myron Roderick
Oral Roberts University: Paul Brynteson, Jack P. Wallace
St. Cloud State University: Kenneth A. Ames, Morris Kurtz

St. Louis University: James Bakken, Albert E. Bender Sr.
 South Dakota, University of: Jack F. Doyle, George R. Horner, Mary Mock
 South Dakota State University: Harry L. Forsyth, Mylo A. Hellickson,
 Ruth Marske
 Southeast Missouri State University: Joseph H. Low Jr., Marvin
 Rosengarten
 Southern Illinois University, Carbondale: John J. Cody, Jim Livengood,
 Margaret Matthias, Albert Somit, Charlotte West
 Southwest Baptist University: Rex Brown
 Southwest Missouri State University: Marshall Gordon, Bill O'Neill, Greg
 Onstot, Bill Rowe, Mary Jo Wynn
 Tulsa, University of: John Benn, Michael W. Davis, Barry A. Kinsey
 Wartburg College: John F. Kurtz
 Washington University (Missouri): Phil Godfrey, Harry E. Kisker, John
 Schael
 West Texas State University: Steven G. Gamble, Bruce A. Grimes, Ed D.
 Roach
 Wichita State University: Warren Armstrong, Lewis Perkins, Martin M.
 Perline, Michael D. Strickland

District 6

Abilene Christian University: Garvin V. Beauchamp
 Alcorn State University: Theophilus Danzy, Norris Allen Edney, Walter
 Washington
 Angelo State University: Kathleen Brasfield, Ollie S. Cauthen, Jerry
 Vandergriff, Lloyd D. Vincent
 Arkansas, University of, Fayetteville: J. Frank Broyles, Ruth Cohoon,
 Albert M. Witte
 Arkansas, University of, Little Rock: Kevin Anglin
 Arkansas State University: Bill Davidson, Sam R. Gennuso, Eugene W.
 Smith
 Baylor University: David Guinn, Bill Menefee
 Centenary College: Walter C. Stevens
 East Texas State University: Vincent J. Gonino, James McFeely
 Eastern New Mexico University: Paul Coggins, B. B. Lees
 Grambling State University: Eddie Milton Jones
 Hardin-Simmons University: L. Ross Johnson
 Houston, University of: Michael T. Johnson, Lee McElroy, Richard L. Van
 Horn
 Houston Baptist University: Ed S. Billings, James Taylor
 Jackson State University: Walter Reed
 Lamar University: Alice C. Bell, Sonny Jolly, Larry W. Spradley
 Louisiana Tech University: Pat Garrett, Paul A. Miller
 McNeese State University: Ted Brevette, Jack V. Doland, Charley W.
 Sparks
 Midwestern State University: Stephen A. Holland
 Mississippi Valley State University: Reginal L. Henderson, Charles
 Prophet
 North Texas State University: Irma Caton, Alfred F. Hurley, Fred N.
 McCain
 Northeast Louisiana University: Maynard M. Dolecheck, Benny Hollis

Northwestern State University (Louisiana): Robert A. Alost, Tynes
 Hildebrand
 Pan American University: Ronald L. Applbaum, Conrad L. Colbert
 Prairie View A&M University: Brutus N. Jackson, Percy A. Pierre
 Rice University: Jerry L. Berndt, James A. Castaneda, Alan J. Chapman,
 August Erfurth, Martha Hawthorne, John R. May
 Sam Houston State University: Tom Davis, Ron Randleman
 Southern Methodist University: Rick Baker, Barbara Camp, Lonnie D.
 Kleiver, Dudley Parker
 Southern University, Baton Rouge: Marino H. Casem
 Southwest Texas State University: Michael Abbott, Dana L. Craft, Robert
 L. Hardesty, Billy M. Miller
 Southwestern Louisiana, University of: Sherry LeBas, Terry Don Phillips,
 Gerard L. St. Martin
 Stephen F. Austin State University: Sadie Allison, Dianne Baker, Jim
 Hess, Harold G. Hill, William R. Johnson, Steve McCarty
 Texas, University of, Arlington: William E. Reeves, Bill Ross
 Texas, University of, Austin: Leon Black, Ronald M. Brown, William H.
 Cunningham, DeLoss Dodds, Beverly Hadaway, Donna A. Lopiano, L. O.
 Morgan, James W. Vick
 Texas, University of, San Antonio: Daniel O. Hogenauer, Jim Skaines
 Texas A&I University: Steven Altman, Pence Dacus
 Texas A&M University: Thomas W. Adair, John David Crow
 Texas Christian University: Tom F. Badgett, Carolyn Dixon, Mel Thomas,
 Frank Windeger
 Texas Southern University: Lionel Taylor
 Texas Tech University: Lauro F. Cavazos, T. Jones, Robert M. Sweazy
 Texas Woman's University: Joanne Kuhn, G. Ann Uhler, Frank Vitro
 Trinity University (Texas): Gene Norris

District 7

Boise State University: Gene Bleymaier, Norman F. Dahm, Carol Ladwig,
 Louis A. Onofrio
 Brigham Young University: Clayne R. Jensen, Glen C. Tuckett, Lu
 Wallace
 Colorado College: Susan Ashley, Susan J. Bethanis, Richard L. Taber
 Colorado School of Mines: R. Bruce Allison, John A. Hogan
 Colorado State University: G. James Francis, L. Oval Jaynes
 Denver, University of: Anthony R. Cillo, Terrence J. Toy, Diane T. Wendt
 Eastern Montana College: Elwood B. Hahn
 Gonzaga University: Dale E. Goodwin
 Hawaii, University of: Ted Livingston, Cynthia Mazda, Stanley B. Sheriff
 Idaho, University of: William S. Belknap, Kathy Clark, W. Harold Godwin
 Idaho State University: Darold H. Chambers, Tom Jewell
 Metropolitan State College: William Helman
 Montana, University of: Evan Denney, Barbara B. Hollmann, Harley W.
 Lewis
 Montana State University: Douglas B. Fullerton, Edward L. Hanson,
 Ginny Hunt
 Nevada, University of, Reno: Christopher H. Exline
 New Mexico, University of: John D. Bridgers, Linda K. Estes, Leon E.

Griffin

Northern Arizona University: Eugene M. Hughes, Tom Jurich, Sam F. McClanahan
Regis College (Colorado): Christopher Dittman
San Diego State University: Robert J. Bruni, Marilyn J. Hatcher, James G. Malik, Fred L. Miller, John Wadas
Southern Utah State College: Steve Lunt, Gerald R. Sherratt, M. L. Smith
Texas, University of, El Paso: Richard W. Burns, Bill Cords
U.S. Air Force Academy: James C. Andrus, Ed Cliatt, Col. John J. Clune, Col. Reuben Cubero
Utah, University of: W. James Copeland, Arnold C. Ferrin, Fern Gardner
Weber State College: Gary T. Crompton, Dean W. Hurst, Stephen D. Nadauld, Richard Ordyna, Carol S. Westmoreland
Wyoming, University of: Mary Ellen Cloninger, Joseph R. Geraud

District 8

Alaska, University of, Anchorage: Jack Peterson, Ronald J. Petro, Lee Piccard
Alaska, University of, Fairbanks: Ed Cridge, Edwin W. Lawrence, Karen J. Morris, Mike Sfraga, Harris Shelton
Arizona, University of: Allan Beigel, Robert Bockrath, Cedric W. Dempsey, Henry Koffler, Mary Roby, Robert W. Sankey
Arizona State University: Herman R. Frazier, Charles S. Harris, Milton R. Schroeder
California, University of, Berkeley: Patrick S. Hayashi, Ira Michael Heyman, Luella J. Lilly, David L. Maggard, Robert F. Steidel Jr.
California, University of, Davis: Pamela L. Gill, Samuel H. Logan, Gale E. Mikles
California, University of, Irvine: John E. Caine, James H. Fallon, Kaia Hedlund, Jack W. Peltason
California, University of, Los Angeles: Peter Dalis, Judith R. Holland, Jim Milhorn, Michael Sondheimer, Charles E. Young
California, University of, Riverside: Chris Rinne, James J. Sims
California, University of, San Diego: Michael Hipp, Andy Skief Jr., Judith M. Sweet
California, University of, Santa Barbara: Michael T. Bowers, Alice Henry, Stanley M. Morrison
California, University of, Santa Cruz: Daniel T. Wood
California Institute of Technology: Warren G. Emery
California Lutheran College: Robert Doering
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo: Marilyn McNeil
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona: Jack B. Frost, Karen L. Miller, Mike Tracey
California State University, Bakersfield: Rudy Carvajal, Gloria A. Friedman, Richard W. Graves, George B. Hibbard
California State University, Chico: Don Miller
California State University, Dominguez Hills: Susan A. Carberry, Suzanne Gemmell, Daniel G. Guerrero
California State University, Fresno: Gary Cunningham, John W. Easterbrook, Diane Milutinovich, Peter Simis
California State University, Fullerton: Edward O. Carroll, Leanne Grotke,

Barbara S. Stone

California State University, Hayward: Judith L. Hirsch, Alfred R. Mathews Jr.
California State University, Long Beach: Kay Don, John V. Kasser, Keith I. Polakoff
California State University, Los Angeles: Gary Hunt, Dennis J. Keihn
California State University, Northridge: Judith M. Brame, James W. Cleary, Robert J. Hiebert, James Sefton
California State University, Sacramento: Donald R. Gerth, Robert Taft Olmstead Jr., Thomas G. Pucci
California State University, San Bernardino: Reginald L. Price
California State University, Stanislaus: Jim Hanny
Chaminade University: Mary Hile-Nepfel, Raymond A. Roesch, Mike Vasconcellos
Chapman College: Walter Bowman, Penny Brush
Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges: John Zinda
Dominican College (California): David M. Weber
Eastern Washington University: H. George Frederickson, C. Peggy Gazette, Frank E. Nelson, Ron Raver
Humboldt State University: John Hennessy, Chuck Lindemenn
La Verne, University of: Nancy Blickenstaff, Roland L. Ortmayer
Lewis and Clark College: Fred O. Wilson
Loyola Marymount University: Rev. James N. Loughran, Margaret P. Olaveson, Brian Quinn
Menlo College: Peter Steiner
Mills College: Robert G. Driscoll
Nevada, University of, Las Vegas: Paul E. Burns, Christina L. Kunzer, Bradley L. Rothermel
New Mexico State University: Karen Fey, Al Gonzales, Del Wells
Occidental College: Richard C. Gilman, Lynn M. Pacala
Oregon, University of: William F. Bryant, Bill Byrne, James M. O'Fallon, Chris Voelz
Oregon State University: John V. Byrne, John R. Davis, Lynn Snyder
Pacific, University of the: Stanley E. McCaffrey, Carl R. Miller, Stanley Volbrecht
Pepperdine University: Wayne Wright
Pomona-Pitzer Colleges: Edward W. Malan, Curtis W. Tong
Portland, University of: Joseph A. Etzel
Portland State University: David W. Coffey, Robert W. Lockwood
Puget Sound, University of: William Dasher, Richard Ulrich
Redlands, University of: Ted C. Runner, Pam Walker
St. Mary's College (California): Donald J. McKillip
San Diego, University of: Thomas F. Burke, Rev. Patrick G. Cahill
San Francisco, University of: Rev. Robert Maloney, Rev. Robert A. Sunderland
San Francisco State University: William E. Partlow, Vic Rowen
San Jose State University: Daniel R. Buerger, Gail Fullerton, Vern Wagner, Charles Whitcomb, Mary M. Zimmerman
Santa Clara University: Thomas J. O'Connor
Seattle Pacific University: Wesley E. Lingren, Keith R. Phillips
Sonoma State University: Ralph Barkey

Southern California, University of: Margaret Gatz, Barbara A. Hedges,
Michael B. McGee, Richard H. Perry, Cornelius J. Pings
Stanford University: Jack H. Friedenthal, Ferdinand A. Geiger, Pamela
Strathairn
U.S. International University: Al J. Palmiotto
Utah State University: Stanford Cazier, E. Kaye Hart, Norman B. Jones,
Rod Tueller
Washington, University of: Richard J. Dunn, Catherine B. Green, Milo R.
Lude
Washington State University: Edward M. Bennett, Marcia L. Saneholtz,
Richard A. Young
Whitman College: Max Seachris
Whittier College: Sherry L. Calvert
Willamette University: Richard Kaiser

Conference Members

Association of Mid-Continent Universities: F. L. Ferzacca
Atlantic Coast Conference: John A. Fuzak, Robert C. James, Jonathan B.
LeCrone
Atlantic 10 Conference: Ron Bertovich
Big East Conference: Linda M. Bruno, David R. Gavitt
Big Eight Conference: Prentice Gautt, Bill Hancock, Carl C. James
Big Sky Conference: Ronald D. Stephenson
Big South Conference: Edward M. Singleton
Big Ten Conference: John D. Dewey, Wayne Duke, Phyllis L. Howlett,
Clarence Underwood Jr.
California Collegiate Athletic Association: Grayle Howell, Bill Husak, Pat
A. Morgan, Tom D. Morgan
*Central Collegiate Hockey Association: Bill Beagan
Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Bob Moorman
Colonial Athletic Association: Thomas E. Yeager
Dixie International Athletic Conference: Donald L. Scalf
East Coast Conference: Ernest C. Casale
Eastern College Athletic Conference: Clayton W. Chapman, Robert M.
Whitelaw
*Eastern College Athletic Conference Metro: Frank Szymanski
Gateway Collegiate Athletic Conference: Patricia Viverito
Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Tom Donahue
Great Lakes Valley Conference: Kathryn Scharf, Richard F. Scharf
*Great West Intercollegiate Hockey Conference: Lawrence D. Garrett
Gulf South Conference: Ralph McFillen
Gulf Star Conference: Dave Waples
*Heartland Collegiate Conference: John J. Hinga
High Country Athletic Conference: margie McDonald
Ivy Group Presidents, Council of: William D. Gurowitz, Connie Huston,
Jeffrey H. Orleans
Lone Star Conference: Shirley Morton
Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference: F. Paul Bogan
Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference: Don J. DiJulia, David Lehn
Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference: Steven J. Hatchell, Craig
Thompson

Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Albert L. Deal
Mid-American Athletic Conference: James W. Lessig, Jamie McCloskey
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference: Kenneth A. Free
Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference: David B. Eavenson
Midwest Athletic Conference for Women: Rich Agness
Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference: Albert E. Negratti
Midwestern Collegiate Conference: James W. Shaffer
Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Carole Herzog
Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Ken B. Jones
Missouri Valley Conference: James A. Haney, Joe Mitch
Mountain West Athletic Conference: Sharon M. Holmberg
New England Collegiate Conference: William M. Leete Jr.
New Jersey Athletic Conference: Lawrence R. Schiner
New South Women's Athletic Conference: G. Rankin Cooter
New York State Women's Collegiate Athletic Association: Dolores A.
Bogard
North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Noel W. Olson
North Coast Athletic Conference: Dennis Collins, Dennis Butler
Northeast-Eight Conference: Elwood N. Shields
Northern California Athletic Conference: James P. Jorgensen
Ohio Athletic Conference: James W. Lessig
Ohio Valley Conference: James E. Delany
Old Dominion Athletic Conference: Daniel E. Wooldridge
Pacific Coast Athletic Association: Lewis A. Cryer, Dennis A. Farrell,
Mike Hartung, Jody McRoberts
Pacific-10 Conference: Thomas C. Hansen, Cheryl L. Levick, Duane P.
Lindberg, David Price
Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference: Rodney C. Kelchner
Southeastern Conference: Robert M. Barrett, James McCullough, Harvey
Schiller, Patricia W. Wall, Mark Womack
Southern Conference: Dave Hart
Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: James E. Hawkins
Southland Conference: Margie Klar, Dick Oliver
Southwest Athletic Conference: Fred Jacoby, Dennis Robinson
Southwestern Athletic Conference: James Frank
State University of New York Athletic Conference: Patrick R. Damore,
Patricia A. Rogers
Sun Belt Conference: Victor A. Bubas, Doug Elgin
Sunshine State Conference: Bob Vanatta
Trans America Athletic Conference: Lou McCullough
West Coast Athletic Conference: Michael M. Gilleran
Western Athletic Conference: Joseph L. Kearney, Dee Anne Menzies
*Western Football Conference: Victor A. Buccola, Don Wilson
Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Kitty R. Baird

*Nonvoting

Affiliated Members

Amateur Basketball Association of the USA: William L. Wall
American Baseball Coaches Association: Ron Polk
American Football Coaches Association: Charles McClendon

California Association of Community Colleges: Walter C. Rilliet
 College Football Association: Charles M. Neinas
 Collegiate Volleyball Coaches Association: Sandra L. Vivas
 Golf Coaches Association of America: Robert E. Nye
 Intercollegiate Tennis Coaches Association: Stanley J. Clark
 Metropolitan Intercollegiate Basketball Association: Peter A. Carlesimo
 National Association of Basketball Coaches: Marv Harshman, Jack Hartman, Joseph R. Vancisin
 National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics: Michael J. Cleary, Timothy W. Gleason
 National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame: Vincent dePaul Draddy, Jimmie McDowell
 National Softball Coaches Association: Judy Martino, Linda Wells
 NCAA Division I Track and Field Coaches Association: Richard Roberts
 Women's Basketball Coaches Association: Betty Jaynes, Regina Sullivan

Corresponding Members

Brigham Young University, Hawaii: LeRoy Overstreet
 Dowling College: Dick Jamison
 Meadowlands Sports Complex: Leslie H. Unger
 Missouri, University of, Kansas City: Lee Hunt, Floyd Walker, Gary Widmar
 North Florida, University of: Tom Healy
 York College of the City University of New York: Stuart Bailin

Visitors

American Sign and Indicator: Don Paschal, Chuck Rogers
 Barrett, John A.
 Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic: Theodore E. Dimauro, Joseph O'Brien, Daniel M. Walsh
 Bluebonnet Bowl: Jim McConn, Ted Nance
 California Association of Health, Physical Education, Recreation & Dance: Kathleen Cordes
 Central State University (Oklahoma): John E. Wagon
 Fellowship of Christian Athletes: John E. Erickson
 Fiesta Bowl: Dan Mardian, Don Meyers, Bruce Skinner
 Findlay College: Max Kidd
 Gator Bowl Association: John Bell
 Hochberg, Philip R.; Washington, D.C.
 HOK-Sports Facilities Group: Dick Martin
 Independence Bowl: Otis Sigler
 John Hancock Sun Bowl: Jeff Jenkins, Sam Jenkins
 Kazmaier Associates: R. W. Kazmaier Jr.
 Liberty Bowl: A. F. Dudley
 Make It Happen, Ltd.: Erv Pinkston
 Molton, Allen & Williams Corporation: William M. Jacka
 Mount St. Vincent, College of: Robert A. Annunziata
 Orange Bowl Committee: Stephen A. Lynch III
 Pasadena Tournament of Roses: Jack Biggar, James Boyle, Harriman Cronk, Millard Davidson, Jack French, Stanley Hahn, Fred Johnson, William Nicholas, Arthur D. Welsh

Peat, Marwick and Mitchell: Robert Novell
 USF&G Sugar Bowl: Mickey Holmes, Jerry Romig
 Wisconsin State University Conference: Max R. Sparger

Working News Media

ABC Sports: Donn R. Bernstein, Harry Chittick
 Amusement Business: Doug Graves, Tom Powell
 Arizona Daily Star: Jack Magreuder
 Associated Press: Dennis Georgatos, Tim Liotta, Holly Stein, Doug Tucker
 Atlanta Journal-Constitution: David Davidson
 Baltimore Sun: Mark Hyman
 Bradley Photography: James T. Bradley
 CBS Sports: Len DeLuca, Neal Pilson, Peter F. Tortorici
 Cable News Network: Ron Forchheimer, John Fricke, Tom Gilmer, Tom Larson
 Channel 8: Dave Cohen
 Charlotte Observer: Leonard Laye
 Chicago Tribune: Linda Kay
 Chronicle of Higher Education: Charles S. Farrell, Doug Lederman, John Phillips
 Cincinnati, University of: Brunson Wright
 College Football Hall of Fame: Pat Harmon
 Cotton Bowl: Field Scovell, Mrs. Field Scovell
 Dallas Morning News: Doug Bedell, Mark Blaudshun, Mike Hashimoto, David McNabb
 Dallas Times-Herald: Steve Schoenfeld
 Des Moines Register: Tom Witosky
 ESPN: Steve Bornstein, Henry Glenn, Loren Matthews, Marla McGuire, Dave Ogren, Boyce Stringer
 Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette: Mark H. Alesia
 Fort Worth Star-Telegram: Jimmy Burch
 Gator Bowl: Ted Emery
 Higher Education Daily: Julie Miller
 Horvite Newspapers: David Glasier
 House of Usher: Charles Usher
 Jefferson-Pilot Teleproductions: Dave Almstead, Mike Burg
 KCST-TV: Whitney Southwick
 KECR and Sports Network: Bob Sterling
 KFMB Radio: Rick Hill
 KSDO Radio: Ron Reina
 KSDS: Gary Silver
 Kansas City Star-Times: Stephen Richardson
 Los Angeles Times: Tracy Dodds, Steve Dolan, Mike Hiserman
 Louisville Courier Journal: Rick Bozich
 Memphis Commercial Appeal: Al Dunning
 Miami News: Jenny Kellner, Rich Rosenblatt
 Minneapolis Star-Tribune: Jay Wiener
 Nashville Banner: Fred Russell
 National Broadcasting Company: Richard J. Hussey
 New American Press: Mark Likgalter
 New York Times: Gordon White

Newsday: Danny Robbins, Manny Topol
 Oklahoman, The: Jerry McConnell
 Orange County Register: Michele Himmelberg
 Philadelphia Inquirer: Frank Dolson
 Raleigh News & Observer: Chip Alexander
 Raycom Sports Network: Tom Ford, Richard Giannini, Ken Haines, Dee Ray, Rick Ray
 Reader, The: Sue Garson
 Reuters: Kristina Rebelo
 Richmond Times-Dispatch: Jerry Lindquist
 Roanoke Times & World-News: Bill Brill
 Rocky Mountain News: Dave Krieger
 Sacramento Bee: Robert Graswich
 San Diego Tribune: Nick Canepa, Tom Cushman, Kirk Kenney, Ed Zieralski
 San Diego Union: Ric Brichen, Chris Jenkins, Tom McMillan
 Sports Illustrated: Robert Sullivan
 Television Productions Company: Jeff Fahren, Kevin O'Malley
 Times-Advocate: Donna Balancia
 Tucson Citizen: Ken Rodriguez
 Turner Broadcasting System: Rex Lardner, John D. Vandegrift
 USA Today: Rudy Martzke, Steve Weiberg
 United Press International: Hilmer Anderson, Earl S. Cryer, David Moffitt
 Voice of America: Mari Womack
 WFAA-TV: Mike Devlins, Tim Loveless
 Washington Post: Mark Asher

81st ANNUAL CONVENTION OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

Tuesday Afternoon, January 6, 1987

The 81st annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, meeting at the Town and Country Hotel, San Diego, California, January 6-9, 1987, was called to order at 3:30 p.m., with President John R. Davis, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

President Davis: Will the delegates please take their seats. We will start the business session momentarily. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Please come to order. We now will officially open the business session for this Convention. As you know, our meetings are conducted under the procedures prescribed by Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised. One such procedure is the need to adopt the Convention Program prior to beginning our business. I now will ask for a motion to adopt the printed program of this Convention so we may proceed with the work of the Convention.

Bonnie Slatton (University of Iowa): I move adoption of the printed program.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

President Davis: Robert's Rules of Order provide that procedures therein may be superseded or replaced by an organization's own traditional and customary procedures. This Association has a number of such procedures and several of them are reviewed in the introductory section of your program, Pages X through XIV. Those also appeared in the Official Notice of the Convention, mailed to you nearly seven weeks ago. In addition, you will find in your program a reference listing of all of the Association's legislation dealing with our Conventions.

All of the NCAA's Convention procedures are designed to ensure fairness and equitable treatment for all members, as well as to eliminate any questions of propriety and to expedite your work as delegates. I will not take the time today to explain all of the parliamentary procedures used to assure fairness. I will remind the delegates, however, that the chair fully intends to apply those procedures throughout. We will, for example, be aware of the number of times an individual speaks on a given issue and the length of the time taken by any one speaker, both matters controlled by Robert's. Also, Robert's says any motion to table that is designed to prevent debate or to kill a motion is dilatory and thus will be ruled out of order. Only a two-thirds majority of this body can suppress debate on any circularized proposal.

There are certain other procedures we employ in attempting to use our time efficiently. First, in all of the business sessions, the chair will attempt to "eyeball" as many votes as possible, calling for a count by the Voting Committee only when there is doubt as to the majority. I ask all delegates to refrain from calling for a vote count unless one seems necessary to determine the disposition of the issue. Second, if delegates intend to debate an issue in any business session, we ask that they be at one of the microphone locations and prepared to speak when the motion has been made and seconded. If the chair sees no one at a microphone, the vote will be called as

quickly as possible. Third, on bylaw issues in the general business session, the chair will call for the vote in the same division sequence each time: Division I first, then Division II and then Division III. The results of a division's vote will not be announced until all divisions have voted.

Each year, in this session, we review the voting and speaking privileges for NCAA Conventions. Each active member institution may have four accredited delegates, one voting and three alternates. They may exchange the voting privilege among them because all have been approved as voters by the chief executive officer of the institution. Active members also may have visiting delegates if they desire, but those visitors may not participate in the Convention in terms of speaking or voting. Member conferences that have voting privileges in accordance with the constitution have the same voting and speaking rights as active members. A member conference that does not have the vote, and any affiliated organization, may have one official delegate who is permitted to speak but not to vote. We ask that these individuals identify themselves and their affiliation clearly when they rise to speak. In fact, to assist the recorder of these proceedings, we ask all who speak to identify themselves and their affiliation at the outset.

Those delegates wearing Convention badges with ribbons are permitted to speak. Those without ribbons are visitors and may not participate other than as observers. So if you come to the business session Thursday or Friday, please be sure to wear your badges because I cannot recognize you if you do not have a badge with a ribbon on it.

Delegates wishing to withdraw a proposal should notify the staff in Suite 1012 in advance of the business session. Just call Suite 1012 and tell the staff of your intention to withdraw. Ladies and gentlemen, these remarks by the chair each year are necessary for the record and to inform those who are attending their first NCAA Convention.

Now, I would like to have your attention while I mention a few things that are new at this year's Convention. We are on a different and extended Convention schedule this year, due partially to the need to use the meeting facilities as efficiently as possible and partially to recognize the increased interest in NCAA Conventions. We have established an all-time attendance record at each of the last six annual Conventions; and we have adjusted the schedule partially to give you, the delegates, some time to meet in conferences and to enjoy the Convention city. This session officially opens the Convention, and the delegates' reception is this evening.

Tomorrow, there are many important conference and other related meetings; but the big change is that the honors luncheon has its own day. It is the only general NCAA gathering tomorrow. We have added a special reception tomorrow evening for presidents and chancellors only; and there have been other amenities added to the Convention environment that we hope you will notice and enjoy, especially the daily diary and fine listing of all important events and schedules.

The first voting occurs Thursday when the division business sessions are held, beginning at 8:00 a.m. For that reason, the deadline to submit any amendments to amendments, any resolutions or any requests for review of interpretations, is 1:00 p.m. tomorrow, Wednesday.

CONVENTION COMMITTEES

President Davis: It is now my privilege to identify for you the several

convention committees and the chair of each. The Nominating Committee is chaired by Cecil W. "Hootie" Ingram, Florida State University. The Men's Committee on Committees is chaired by Dennis J. Keihn, California State University, Los Angeles. The Women's Committee on Committees is chaired by Eve Atkinson, Temple University; the Voting Committee, Donald G. Combs, Eastern Kentucky University; the Committee on Credentials, Jane Goss, Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania; the Memorial Resolutions Committee, Nancy Vedral, Northern Illinois University.

In accordance with NCAA procedures, the reports of the sports committees and general committees are not presented orally. These are included in the printed Annual Reports. A copy of the Annual Reports is available at the registration desk for each member institution and member conference. The report of the secretary-treasurer and that of the Executive Committee also appear in the Annual Reports. Please be reminded, then, that at the beginning of the general business session Friday morning, we will entertain motions to receive and approve those two reports. I also would point out to you that all official actions taken during the year by the Executive Committee have appeared in *The NCAA News*.

We move now to the report of the NCAA Council for 1986. To present that report, it is my distinct pleasure to introduce a member of the Council whose term is ending with this Convention. She was one of the very first women ever selected to serve on an NCAA committee; and it is fitting, indeed, that she becomes the first woman ever selected to present the annual Council report to the Convention.

May I present the chair of the Department of Physical Education and Athletics at the University of Chicago, Mary Jean Mulvaney.

REPORT OF COUNCIL

Mary Jean Mulvaney (University of Chicago): Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Association. After serving on the Council for four years and on a number of NCAA committees, I am pleased and privileged to present the 1986 NCAA Council report. This report is required by the NCAA constitution. It is a summary of the Council's actions during the past year. The full report is available from two sources. One is *The NCAA News*, which publishes within approximately two weeks of each Council meeting a complete listing of the Council's actions. This past year, those reports appeared in the January 22, April 30, September 8 and October 27 issues of the *News*. The other source is the printed NCAA Annual Reports, which are distributed here at the Convention and also mailed to each member institution. The Annual Reports contain the abridged minutes of the Council's January, April and August meetings. The printing schedule did not permit inclusion of the October minutes in the current year's book, so they will appear in next year's book. The October actions were reported to you in *The NCAA News*.

The major developments this past year were as follows. The Council determined in its April meeting that it would focus its attention in 1986 on four major areas. In each of the four, it created a Council subcommittee. While all of those subcommittees intend to continue its work into 1987, there are significant proposals before you at this Convention from each of them.

The Subcommittee to Review Financial Aid Issues, chaired by David L.

Maggard of the University of California, Berkeley, developed Proposal No. 44, certainly one of the major issues to be acted upon at this Convention. It appears to answer the concerns expressed in the past regarding the right of each division to determine the details on its own financial aid limitations.

The Subcommittee to Review the Recruiting Process has proposed what we may consider to be the most significant package of recruiting legislation in many years: Nos. 47, 48 and 49. I believe that committee intends to return with more recruiting legislation at the 1988 Convention. It is ably chaired by Albert M. Witte of the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.

The Subcommittee to Review Coaches Outside Income, chaired by B. J. Skelton, of Clemson University, offers four proposals: Nos. 50, 51, 52 and 53. What those say, for the most part, is that the institution should know and approve of outside monies that a coach receives because of the job he holds at that university.

Finally, the Subcommittee to Review Playing Seasons will make its major proposals at the next Convention. It does have, however, two proposals, Nos. 123 and 124, to restrict further the basketball contest opportunities that do not count toward the season limitation in that sport. That subcommittee was chaired first by our secretary-treasurer, Wilford S. Bailey of Auburn University, and now by Mikki Flowers of Old Dominion University.

The Council also took steps this year to strengthen the satisfactory progress requirements in Divisions I and II, and you will vote on that approach in Proposal No. 46. Discussions of initial-eligibility standards and satisfactory-progress requirements occur in each Council meeting, and there should be little doubt remaining that the term student-athlete has and will have much greater validity than critics would have you believe.

In other issues considered this past year, in its August meeting, the Council approved in principle a comprehensive reevaluation of the Association's programs, services and management procedures. In the October meeting, we voted to sponsor legislation at this Convention to overhaul the NCAA's committee structure and to streamline a number of administrative procedures. Those proposals appear, for the most part, in the consent packages. We recommend them to you as a necessary step in diminishing as much as possible the bureaucratic tendencies that are inherent in any democratic and growing organization. We hope all members support those steps. It might be worth noting that this package of legislation includes another step in the "federation" of the NCAA. Specifically, by approving the consent packages, you will enable interpretations and eligibility rulings that apply to a student-athlete in a given division to be determined by representatives of that same division. That appears to be a logical next step.

I also call to your attention the fact that the NCAA Council, acting at the recommendation of the Long Range Planning Committee, voted this past year to reaffirm the Association's intention to continue to apply affirmative-action principles to appointments of women to NCAA committees and to accord greater recognition of the position of primary woman administrator of athletics programs. It also voted to sponsor the legislation before you here that will create a standing committee on women's athletics. This comes six full years after the so-called "Governance Plan" was adopted at the 1981 Convention, and it clearly demonstrates the NCAA's continued

commitment to providing the best programs and service possible for women's athletics.

Mr. President, there were numerous other topics discussed and acted upon by the Council in the past year that could be included in this summary. I believe, however, that I have fairly summarized the key issues of the past year; so I will conclude this report of the 1986 NCAA Council. Friday morning, at the beginning of the General Business Session, there will be a motion to have the Convention accept and approve the Council's full report for 1986.

President Davis: Thank you, Mary Jean, and happy birthday, too. At this point in the agenda, we will have the report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. I would like to ask all delegates and our friends in the news media to please remain silent during the reading of the memorial resolutions. Now, may I present Nancy Vedral of Northern Illinois University, the chair of the Memorial Resolutions Committee.

REPORT OF THE MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Nancy Vedral (Northern Illinois University): I would like to introduce the other members of the committee who are not here today. They are: Bradford W. Hovious of Delta State University and Reginald L. Price of California State University, San Bernardino. We ask you to stand during the reading of those who have passed away during the past year. They are:

Paul "Sparky" Adams, Baldwin-Wallace College
Charles W. Bachman, Michigan State University
Allan Bailey, Duquesne University
Alex F. Bell, Villanova University
Glen Brown, Northern Michigan University
Chet Bryan, Oklahoma State University
William O. "Billy" Bustle, Baptist College
Frank Butsko, Mansfield University of Pennsylvania
Prince G. "Prink" Callison, University of Oregon
Frank Camp, University of Louisville
Harry G. Carlson, University of Colorado
Richard Carter, Holy Cross College
Paul Castner, University of Notre Dame
Eugene B. Chadwick, Delta State University
Jack Christiansen, Stanford University
Edmund L. Coombs, Bowdoin College
James H. "Sleepy Jim" Crowley, Fordham University
Rev. Wilfred F. Crowley, Santa Clara University
Jim Doerr, Iowa State University
Sterling Dupree, University of Georgia
Ray Eddy, Purdue University
Mike Ehrenfried, Denison University
Lon Farrell, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
C. Max Farrington, George Washington University
Robert E. Finley Sr., Southern Methodist University
George Furey, Columbia University-Barnard College
Glenn Gerdes, University of Wisconsin, Superior
Richard P. Gibney, Lehigh University
Robert S. Guelker, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville

Billy Harris, Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science
 Thomas S. "Dick" Hitt, Mississippi College
 Art Hutton, University of Washington
 Leroy V. Jay, North Carolina State University
 F. V. "Bud" Johnson, University of Evansville
 Ruth Jones, Purdue University
 Marty G. Karow, Ohio State University
 Frank J. "Doc" Kavanaugh, Cornell University
 John A. "Snooks" Kelley, Boston College
 Edward T. Kennedy, Columbia University-Barnhard College
 John W. Kitzmiller, University of Oregon
 Roy E. Lee, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville
 William W. Loika, Central Connecticut State University
 James K. Luck, Georgia Institute of Technology
 Paul M. Maaske, Cornell College
 Glenn E. "Ted" Mann, Duke University
 G. L. "Doc" Mathis, East Carolina University
 Ray C. "Doc" Mauro, Gonzaga University
 Bill McCarthy, New York University
 Dave McClain, University of Wisconsin, Madison
 Frank D. McGrath, DePaul University
 Earl Jay "Fuzz" Merritt, Pomona-Pitzer Colleges
 Pete Murphy, Trinity University (Texas)
 William D. Murray, Duke University
 John "Jake" Nevin, Villanova University
 Michael J. "Mickey" O'Brien, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
 Alden Pasche, University of Houston
 E. K. Patty, Middle Tennessee State University
 Lloyd W. Peterson, University of Minnesota, Duluth
 Joseph M. Pettit, Georgia Institute of Technology
 Donald Phelps, Campbell University
 Herman E. Phillips, Purdue University
 James Robert Polk, University of Alabama, Birmingham
 Frederick D. "Fritz" Pollard, Lincoln University of Pennsylvania
 Edwin Powell, University of Maryland, College Park
 Cleburne Price, University of Texas, Austin
 Bill Rohr, Ohio University
 Joseph R. Scalzo Sr., University of Toledo
 Dick Scesniak, Kent State University
 Frank Scott, San Diego State University
 Frank W. Soltys, University of Arizona
 Clarence "Pop" Strange, Louisiana State University
 William C. Stryker, Princeton University
 Fred C. Thomsen, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
 Clarence "Buckshot" Underwood, University of Kentucky
 Andrew J. Vasilovik, Lewis University
 Wallace Wade, Duke University
 Woodrow "Woody" West, University of Tulsa
 Roy Wietz, Western Michigan University
 James B. Wilson, Canisius College

Let us honor our deceased colleagues with a moment of silence. Thank

you.

President Davis: The Memorial Resolutions Committee will present a supplementary report prior to the end of this Convention. If anyone has additional names to report, please notify Nancy Vedral or any member of the staff.

This concludes the opening session. May I remind you that the report of the Council, the Executive Committee and the treasurer will be dealt with by motions on Friday morning. There is a new procedure that I wish to remind you of. The executive regulations that have been adopted by the Executive Committee during the year that have appeared in The NCAA News can be rescinded by a resolution that must also be submitted by 1:00 p.m. on Wednesday if you care to do so. Now, this concludes the business session, and we will see you tomorrow at the honors luncheon. Thank you so much for your kind attention.

[The opening session adjourned at 4:30 p.m.]

NCAA HONORS LUNCHEON

Wednesday, January 7, 1987

President Davis: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. It is my pleasure to welcome you to the Association's 22nd annual honors luncheon. The Very Reverend L. Edward Glynn, president of St. Peter's College and a member of the NCAA Presidents Commission, will present our invocation.

Very Reverend Edward Glynn (St. Peter's College): Let us pray. Almighty God, creator of all that is good and beautiful, as we gather at this honors luncheon to celebrate the beauty and the goodness of the lives of our award recipients, we pause to ask Your blessings upon these men and women whom we single out this afternoon for national recognition. The excellence of their lives is an inspiration to us, and it shows forth in our world the beauty of the goodness of Your gift to them and their personal commitment to do what is theirs to do in building a better world. These top six have excelled in community service, in academic achievements and athletics accomplishments. Our silver anniversary honorees and our Theodore Roosevelt Award recipient have continued throughout decades their commitment to excellence. We are grateful to You and to them for these gifts to our world. We ask You also to bless their families and friends present with us today, and lastly, we ask You to bless our food, our drink, our conversation. All this we ask of Your goodness. Amen.

President Davis: Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, we need to begin our program at this time. I am aware that some of you are still finishing your lunch. I encourage you to please continue while I make some preliminary observations and introductions before I present our honored guests to you.

During the past year, the Association's commitment to providing intercollegiate athletics opportunities for student-athletes within the mission of higher education has focused on two areas. Both provide crucial first steps to ensuring that these students truly are representative of the student body and that the competition in which they participate is both wholesome and equitable for all competitors.

Recruiting abuses, which always will be the Achilles' heel of intercollegiate athletics, continue to attract newspaper headlines and skepticism from the public. We continue our efforts to reduce those abuses. It is my belief, however, that our actions this year in two other areas will confront directly the myriad pressures that are prevalent on our campuses and throughout our society. I speak now of the Association's total commitment to strengthening the academic capability of student-athletes and the academic integrity of intercollegiate athletics in higher education, and secondly, to the implementation of drug-testing and drug-education programs, which will encourage student-athletes to maximize their abilities without the use of potentially harmful performance-enhancing drugs or other drugs that place the athletes at a risk in many ways.

Today, we salute current and former athletes who have confronted those pressures and have established themselves as role models for our society. These men and women whom we honor epitomize the top echelon of athletics participation, and their accomplishments and backgrounds no doubt remind each of us of many other young men and women who similarly have

conquered those pressures through hard work and self-discipline. Each of these student-athletes provides us with personal victories that both enhance and rededicate our commitment to providing wholesome athletics opportunities for men and women who represent our institutions of higher learning.

I believe that each of us will leave this room today with a renewed commitment to providing the greatest academic and athletics opportunities possible for those who will follow in the footsteps of these outstanding individuals whom we honor today.

At this time, I wish to introduce an individual who long has made significant contributions to this Association, his conference and his university. He has earned the respect of faculty, administrators and coaches as an admired academician who has maintained a personal commitment to administering broad-based athletics within the framework of higher education. He equally has established himself as a tireless worker who has tackled a variety of challenges, from recodifying and restructuring the NCAA constitution and bylaws to negotiating television contracts. He will continue his commitment to ensure that athletics compliment the mission of higher education when he becomes the Association's next president at the conclusion of this Convention.

I am fortunate, both personally and professionally, that I have had the opportunity to work closely with our secretary-treasurer during the past year. I present to you Wilford S. Bailey, professor and faculty athletics representative at Auburn University.

Seated to my left is a man whom I have come to admire greatly and whose friendship I treasure. He has been the right man at the right time, providing outstanding leadership and initiative to the NCAA for over 30 years—the executive director of the NCAA, Walter Byers.

It is a distinct honor for me to present our master of ceremonies to you. He is one of the world's premier journalists, and we are most appreciative that he took time from his demanding schedule to join us today.

Dan Rather's career in journalism began before he received his degree from Sam Houston State University in 1953. As an undergraduate who majored in journalism, he became a reporter for the Associated Press and later added assignments from United Press International, radio stations in Huntsville and Houston, and the Houston Chronicle. He added journalism instructor duties at Sam Houston State to his various reporting responsibilities and in 1959 accepted his first television assignment in Houston. Dan then became news director of that city's CBS affiliate before joining CBS network news in 1962. He first was chief of the southwest bureau in Dallas and then accepted a similar assignment in New Orleans, where he distinguished himself as a news reporter during and after the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

Dan was assigned to cover the White House in 1964 and temporarily left to head the CBS news bureaus in London and then Saigon before returning to that beat in Washington. He then became the anchor of CBS Reports in 1974, and then became coeditor of 60 Minutes for six years. He also anchored the Saturday and Sunday editions of CBS Evening News. Dan has served as anchor and managing editor of the CBS Evening News and has anchored a weekday broadcast on the CBS Radio Network since March 9, 1981.

Recently voted the most respected and most trusted anchor man by separate national polls, Dan also was the only journalist to be voted one of the top 10 most influential decision-makers in America and in leadership surveys conducted by a national publication. Dan is the recipient of numerous journalistic awards. He has received five Emmy Awards, the Distinguished Achievement for Broadcasting Award and the Public Education Award in Media. Dan also was elected a Fellow of the Society of Professional Journalists and has received Doctorates from Roosevelt University, Boston University and Syracuse University.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to present to you Mr. Dan Rather.

Dan Rather: Thank you very much, Jack, for that overly generous introduction including my confirmation pictures some years back. (Laughter) I am also reminded of what Abe Lincoln said about such overly generous introductions. That is, do not take time to deny them because the audience will find out soon enough the real truth. (Laughter)

I have looked over the list of people in attendance today, and what a distinguished group of people. I have also looked over the list of people who have had the pleasure and honor of doing what I am doing today, and that is serve as master of ceremonies for this wonderful and classy event of the NCAA. I find myself, I think, feeling a little like Elizabeth Taylor's sixth husband. I know what is expected of me, I think I know how to do it but I am not just sure I can keep it interesting. (Laughter) But we are going to try. I am going to make a real effort here to keep this program moving along and to keep it focused on where it should be, and that is on our 12 honorees today. If you will indulge me very quickly and briefly, let me recognize two people in the audience who are very important to me, good friends of mine and working colleagues of mine, Mr. Neil Pilson of CBS, Incorporated, and Thomas Potago, who is the executive producer of the Evening News. (Applause)

Among the reasons that it is a special pleasure for me to be here today is that our entire network is still celebrating and taking such great pride, we think justifiably, in our association with the NCAA and our having obtained the exclusive television rights again to the Division I Men's Basketball Championships, something particularly near to my heart. I am a basketball fan. Those who know me say there is no good in saying that, Dan; because in baseball you are a fan and in football you are a fan. That is all true. Those associated with the Division I Men's Basketball Championship know how very special it is to all of us at CBS, including those of us at CBS News, to have the honor and privilege of broadcasting it. We are delighted we will have that privilege in the foreseeable future. The Final Four is certainly one of the premier sporting events in the world, and our network knows that the rights of this championship to CBS mean more than any other sports program available to television. We are mighty proud to have it. We congratulate Neil Pilson for bringing it home again.

I look forward to the time we have here today for a number of reasons, not the least of which is that it is such a pleasure to be associated with a man such as Walter Byers. I know you have given him your round of applause before, but, 35 years in building the NCAA into what it is today, 35 years of dedication, commitment to excellence is a long time. We talk about the premier sports, the premier sports spectacles on the American scene. You

will want to argue that the World Series is up there or the Super Bowl is up there with it. But it has not always been thus. Walter, I hope it will not be an embarrassment to you to say that I want to give you my special recognition and call for another round of applause for a man who has as St. Paul wrote to his adopted son Timothy, "You have fought the good fight." Finish the race and keep the faith. (Applause)

Also, I would be derelict, I think, if I did not pick up on something that was said up here earlier. That is the press coverage of the problem of inter-collegiate athletics today. It certainly is true that the press, perhaps you prefer the word media, and society as a whole has held intercollegiate athletics and athletics competition to a higher standard than most others in our society on such things as what you are going to do about drugs. What you are going to do about academic standards.

We have held you to a higher standard than others. What is encouraging to me, if you will allow me the indulgence of a personal aside here, is how well the NCAA has responded to that and how encouraging it is to hear the conversation that we did in the room before we came in to this wonderful luncheon about the steps that have been taken to meet that higher standard. I want to compliment those of you in this room who have had the responsibility of leadership, those of you who have been engaged in administering athletics at the collegiate level for meeting the challenge, responding and saying yes. You are holding to this higher standard. We will take that challenge. We are going to do something about it, and here is what we are going to do about it: one, two, three. For that, I salute you. Again, Walter Byers, I know your leadership role in doing that and I congratulate you on it. Now having said that, I want to move this along quite quickly. I talked to Walter just before I came in here and I was reminded of a story. We had a coaching opportunity down home around Horton. Horton is a two blinker-light town below Houston. During the Depression, believe me, the economic situation cut very deeply; and there were not very many openings in our school district. They had one opening over a period of about nine years for a combination assistant football coach and physics teacher.

The legend in our county, which as Dr. Kissinger once said has the added advantage of being true, was that they had something like 250 applicants; but it got down to about a final 10 pretty quickly because most of them had no background in physics whatsoever.

It got down to the final three, and Mr. Smith, who was the toughest man in our county in the sense that he would talk straight to you and ask the right questions, when he got down to the final two had this one applicant to whom he said: "Young man, let's forget your qualifications in football. I know you attended Texas A&M, and you can coach football. I want to know if you are able to teach physics. It says you took physics. You also had to teach geography. I want to know how are you going to teach it?" This applicant needed this job so badly, he said, "I can teach it round or teach it flat. You just tell me how you want it taught." (Laughter) So when I asked Walter how do you want this, he said just do it straight and do it quickly. So we will get on to it.

Before I begin to introduce the honorees to you, I do ask that you take a second, do it right now, and review in your luncheon program the impressive list of 90 student-athletes who have combined academic and athletics excellence to earn the \$2,000 NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship to continue

their education. The Association has invested more than \$2.5 million in assisting 1,739 student-athletes to pursue graduate credit since 1964. Take a second to look at that.

The chair of the NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship Committee is seated to my right. He is Ralph N. Floyd, director of athletics at Indiana University, Bloomington. (Applause) If you think it is not full-time work supervising such outstanding coaches, as Bobby Knight and supervising this Postgraduate Scholarship Committee, you might want to talk to Ralph right after this session is over. (Laughter)

Now, the College Athletics Top Twelve. The Top Twelve permits the Association to honor six outstanding student-athletes from the preceding year and six former letter-winners who have distinguished themselves in their chosen professions on their silver anniversary as college graduates. The criteria for each of these categories and the members of the Selection Committee are listed in your program.

I will begin by introducing the current student-athletes to you.

Lisa Ice, San Jose State University, Volleyball.

When Lisa Ice enrolled at San Jose State University, most everyone associated with women's volleyball readily agreed that she could become a world-class performer; and all of you know what kind of pressure that puts on you. Two years ago, she sustained a knee injury that could have stopped her from pursuing international acclaim in her sport. Some of those who previously were generous with compliments about her abilities became skeptics. But those who questioned her abilities when she sustained her injury are not visible today. They underestimated Lisa's desire to excel. Today, she is continuing to establish an international reputation as one of the world's premier volleyball players.

A three-time all-conference performer, she also earned all-America honors academically, establishing a 3.200 grade-point average. She set conference and state and San Jose State records and last year was selected the Greater San Jose Sports Association's Athlete of the Year. Lisa captained the volleyball team, twice was named the Pacific Coast Athletic Association player of the month and served as a student trainer for the entire women's athletics program.

She will receive her award from San Jose State's director of women's athletics, Mary Zimmerman.

Jon L. Louis, Stanford University, Gymnastics.

As a result of the success of the United States men's and women's teams at the Los Angeles Olympics, gymnastics rapidly has become one of this country's most popular sports. Jon Louis will be one of America's realistic hopes for a gold medal at the 1988 Olympic Games. He completed an outstanding intercollegiate career last spring by winning the NCAA all-around championship.

A three-time all-America in the all-around, parallel bars and rings, the Pacific-10 Conference gymnast of the year led Stanford University to its highest finish ever in the NCAA championships, placing third. Jon also has been active in international competition and was a member of the 1985 United States national team. He competed in the International Sports Fair in Tokyo last May and earned medals in the Moncada Cup and the Maccaiah Games.

Jon also is active in dramatics at Stanford and established a B average

majoring in communications. He produced and created a gymnastics video at the request of CBS Sports, and he devotes a great deal of time to the Stanford Educational Television Network.

Jon will receive his award from Pam Strathairn, associate director of athletics at Stanford.

Cheryl D. Miller, University of Southern California, Basketball.

Cheryl Miller, perhaps not even arguably, is the greatest player in the history of women's basketball, period.

A four-time consensus all-American selection at the University of Southern California, Cheryl three times was selected the national player of the year. She twice was named the most outstanding participant in intercollegiate sports and became the first basketball player, man or woman, in USC history to receive the honor of having the university retire the participant's number.

Cheryl was the leading scorer in the 1984 Olympic Games and led the United States to gold medals in the Olympics and the 1983 Pan American Games. She set a number of USC records, including 45 points and 24 rebounds in one game, 26.8 season scoring and 15.8 rebounding averages, and career averages of 23.7 points and 12.1 rebounds in 128 games.

She has been active in numerous fund-raising and charity events. Cheryl was the national chairperson for Athletes for Kids and commissioner of the Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee Summer Youth Games. She also has been a spokesperson for the Los Angeles Literary Campaign and the YWCA Shelter for Battered Women. She represented the Civil Rights Act of 1984 on Capitol Hill.

Cheryl has received the YWCA Silver Achievement Award, a Black Achievement Award, hosted by the National Miracle Children's Telethon and participated in the Live Aid Benefit Concert. A few weeks ago, Mayor Tom Bradley, himself a former NCAA Theodore Roosevelt Award winner, honored her by proclaiming Cheryl Miller Day in Los Angeles.

Cheryl will receive her award from Barbara Hedges, associate director of athletics at Southern California.

John Moffett, Stanford University, Swimming.

John Moffett's renowned swimming career has suffered only one major setback. He was favored to win a gold medal in the 1984 Olympics, but he pulled a muscle in the first preliminary race in the 100-meter breaststroke on the opening day of competition. He attempted to swim in the event heavily taped and finished fifth, but the injury required him to withdraw from the 200-meter breaststroke and, eventually, from the entire competition.

That disappointment, however, did not stop John's desire to remain the world's best swimmer in the 100- and 200-meter breaststroke. He won five individual NCAA championships and swam on the 400-meter relay team that established an American record in the 1985 NCAA championships. A member of the 1980 and 1984 Olympic teams, he set the world record in the 100-meter breaststroke in the 1984 Olympic trials and won three gold medals in the World University Games. He was selected world breaststroker of the year by Swimming World magazine.

John received a Pacific-10 Conference medal recognizing a senior athlete who exhibits the greatest performance in achievement, scholarship, athletics and leadership. He established a 3.200 grade-point average majoring in design. He served on the Stanford President's Advisory Committee on

Athletics, Physical Education and Recreation; and he was active in the Special Olympics and in his fraternity.

John, who is attending Oxford University and studying art history, will receive his award from Stanford's faculty athletics representative, Jack Friedenthal.

Dub W. Myers, University of Oregon, Track.

The University of Oregon has developed an international reputation as one of this nation's premiere training centers for track and field athletes. Most track fans instantaneously associate success in long-distance running with Oregon track. Dub Myers is the latest world-class athlete to add to that tradition. His four-year career has been filled with numerous honors, both athletically and academically.

He earned all-America honors in track each of his four seasons and complemented that recognition in the classroom by establishing a 3.78 grade-point average while majoring in computer information science and minoring in economics.

Dub won the national championship in the 1,500-meter run in June. He also won the Pacific-10 Conference championship in both the 1,500-meter and 800-meter runs and just missed earning a berth on the United States Olympic team following his sophomore season. Active in several extracurricular activities that utilize both his athletics and academic talents, Dub assisted in the development of a computer program for Goodwill Industries, which currently is in use; and he has been an active leader in the Campus Crusade for Christ.

Dub will receive his award from Oregon's director of athletics, Bill Byrne.

Megan Neyer, University of Florida, Diving.

Megan Neyer is in very select company. She has won eight of the 10 one-meter and three-meter diving championships sponsored by the NCAA. Only three other women, Tracy Caulkins, a Florida teammate, and North Carolina University's Sue Walsh, each of whom previously was selected a Top Six honoree, and Stanford University's Marybeth Linzmier, ever have won as many as eight individual NCAA championships.

Megan was the 1986 NCAA diver of the year. She also won eight Southeastern Conference championships and five three-meter and six one-meter board titles in United States National Diving Championship competition. A member of the 1980 United States Olympic diving team in both the three-meter and platform events, she has won several international competitions, including the World and Australian National Springboard Championships and the Swedish Cup Championship. She also represented the United States in dual competition against China.

Megan earned academic all-America honors in the classroom. She established a 3.61 grade-point average majoring in Psychology and was awarded an NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship. A member of the Golden Key National Honor Society, Megan is a spokesperson for several charities and is an active member of a campus alcohol-awareness organization.

Megan will receive her award from Ann Marie Lawler, assistant athletics director at Florida.

Now, that is the first half of our honoree program. It is time to have the representative of the Top Six make a response. Cheryl Miller will respond on behalf of the current student-athletes.

Cheryl Miller (University of Southern California): Thank you, Mr. Rather. To the NCAA committee, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of those chosen by the NCAA for recognition, we are tremendously happy to be put on the pedestal and showcased as role models for others to emulate.

Right now, at this very moment in history, you see in America a country that has political freedom to an extent undreamed of in many parts of the civilized world; and in our surroundings, we see the greatest and most far-reaching educational system that man has created. Three questions come to mind. One, does this bring us a sense of fulfillment? Two, do they help us display why we are here? Three, do they point out what we have learned?

The answers to these questions are all a definite yes.

As we head into the 21st century, more will have to be done. We will have to provide leadership and serve as role models for others to follow as well as exceed. In closing, we would like to praise the parents, teachers, counselors, coaches and friends. For even though the work was hard, the hours very, very long, your job was well done. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Mr. Rather: Thank you, Cheryl. I congratulate you and each of the other nominees. It is a pleasure for me to be with you here today.

Now, we salute the Silver Anniversary honorees. In the spirit of and perhaps you were taught the same thing, in my time and place, the coaches used to say that any time you are more than 500 miles away from home you are welcomed to claim you were a starter. (Laughter) The corollary to that was that five years out of school you can say that you were all-Conference, ten years out of school you can claim you are all-American. These ladies and gentlemen have been out 25 years. (Laughter)

As my friend Bill Cohen said, I guess that entitles them to now claim they are everybody's all-ever team.

Lamar Alexander, Vanderbilt University, Track.

For the past eight years, Lamar Alexander has served as governor of the State of Tennessee. He was the first Tennessee governor to serve two successive four-year terms, and only the state constitution prevented him from seeking a third term. Lamar Alexander was chosen one of the two most effective governors in the nation by his peers and named one of the 10 rising political stars of the future by a national news magazine. He was chair of the National Governors' Association.

A two-year letterman in track at Vanderbilt, he ran on the school-record 440-yard relay team that finished second in the Southeastern Conference. He also earned Phi Beta Kappa, was editor of the school newspaper and yearbook, was senate president pro tem, served on the President's Round Table, and was president of Sigma Chi and Omicron Delta Kappa, among other activities.

During his two terms as Governor, he pioneered a \$1.2 billion Tennessee Better Schools Program, which included a "career ladder" incentive-pay plan for teachers, a summer resident program for gifted students, and Centers of Excellence and Chairs of Excellence at public universities. He has attracted \$1.2 billion in foreign investments to the state, creating about 8,000 jobs.

He was appointed chair of President Reagan's Commission on American Outdoors and recently received the National Conservation Achievement Award from the National Wildlife Federation. A member of the Maryville

College Board of Trustees, the governor actively participates in Boy Scouts work and numerous Community Day, activities where he annually works on projects that benefit the entire community.

Governor Alexander will receive his award from Vanderbilt's director of athletics, Roy Kramer.

William S. Cohen, Bowdoin College, Basketball.

For the past 15 years, Bill Cohen has represented the State of Maine in the United States Congress. He first represented his constituents in the Second Congressional District in the House of Representatives for three terms. He then became a member of the United States Senate in 1978 and is in his second, six-year term representing all of the people of Maine.

As an undergraduate at Bowdoin College, he was a three-year basketball starter who twice led the team in scoring. He also played in the New England all-Star Game. Bill Cohen received several academic awards and was active in the theatrical organization and wrote for the literary magazine.

He received 77 percent of the vote in the 1976 House race and unseated the incumbent in his first Senate election. He was in the spotlight during his second term in Congress when he participated in the House Judiciary Committee's impeachment proceedings; and, during that same term, he was named one of the most outstanding 10 young men in America. Senator Cohen is a member of the Armed Services Committee, the Special Committee on Aging and the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Governmental Affairs Committee's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations and chairs the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management. He recently was appointed to the Select Senate Committee that would investigate the Iran-Contra Controversy.

A member of the Bowdoin College Board of Overseers, he recently received the New England Association of School Superintendents' President's Award for his efforts to improve public education.

Senator Cohen will receive his award from Bowdoin's director of athletics, Sidney J. Watson.

Alexander Kroll, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, Football.

When Alex Kroll joined Young & Rubicam, Inc., as a trainee four days after his graduation from Rutgers, most people probably thought that he had a bright future with the largest advertising agency in the world. After all, he had been recognized as the National Football Foundation Hall of Fame Scholar-Athlete after earning consensus all-America honors as a football center. An English literature major, he was captain of an undefeated Rutgers team and played in the North-South and Senior Bowl games.

Most of those who thought Alex had a bright future with Young & Rubicam probably questioned their initial instinct when he left the agency four months later to begin a professional football career with the New York Titans. He returned to Young & Rubicam after one season; and, after a series of writing and supervision jobs in the creative department, at age 33 he became the youngest person ever named executive vice-president and worldwide creative director by the agency.

He began managing Young & Rubicam's advertising agencies five years later; and, at age 45, he was named president and chief operating officer. Three years later, chief executive officer was added to his title. He became

chairman in 1986. The Young & Rubicam corporate structure includes the largest public relations company, medical advertising and direct-marketing group of any advertising agency in the world.

A member of the American Association of Advertising Agency's Board of Directors, Alex also is chair for the Committee for Creative Excellence. He is a member of the National Urban League and participates in the United Negro College Fund and the Greater New York Council of Boy Scouts of America, among many other activities.

Alex will receive his award from Edward J. Bloustein, president of Rutgers University, New Brunswick.

Merlin Olsen, Utah State University, Football.

To many television viewers, he is known as Father Murphy. To some, he probably is that man who sells flowers for FTD florists. To me, he would be the man doing the analysis on Sunday's coverage of the Cleveland-Denver play-off game. To all of us, he is recognized as one of the most outstanding linemen who ever played college or professional football. Merlin Olsen was a consensus all-America at Utah State University and received the Outland Trophy as college football's outstanding lineman.

He also was a three-time academic all-America selection, graduated summa cum laude with a 3.640 grade-point average as a finance major, and was a National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame scholar-athlete. Merlin was commander of the Combined Air Force Army-ROTC Units, Phi Beta Kappa, twice president of his class and was named the top student in the college of business his final three years at Utah State.

He was the No. 1 draft choice of the Los Angeles Rams and was selected the NFL's defensive rookie of the year. Merlin played 15 professional seasons while establishing an NFL record with 14 appearances in the Pro Bowl game. He was selected to the quarter-century all-NFL/AFL team for the years 1960 to 1985 and to the NFL's team of the decade for both the 1960's and the 1970's. He established Los Angeles records for most games played and consecutive games.

Following his outstanding professional football career, he became a television star. He had leading roles on such series as Father Murphy, Little House On The Prairie, and Fathers and Sons.

I am told he currently is acclaimed as one of television's best football analysts on some television network. (Laughter)

A member of both the College Football and NFL Halls of Fame, Merlin is a motivational consultant for 50 of the Fortune 500 companies. He is cohost of the nationally broadcast Children's Miracle Network Telethon that has raised \$70 million for children's hospitals in the United States and Canada, and he has cochaired with his wife the Champions for Multiple Sclerosis the past nine years. He was selected the outstanding MS volunteer in 1981.

He participates in numerous other fund-raising and charitable organizations, benefitting such causes as battered and abused children and the United Way campaign.

Merlin will receive his award from the president of Utah State University, Stanford Cazier.

Joseph Romig, University of Colorado, Football.

Most of you who are in the audience today probably are familiar with the mission of the Voyager spacecraft. As you know, it has passed Jupiter, Saturn and Uranus and is currently moving closer to Neptune. But most of you

probably are not aware that one of the leading research physicists involved in the project is a former Rhodes scholar from the University of Colorado, who, along with Alex Kroll and Merlin Olsen, could have provided the nucleus for an offensive line behind which even I could have gained a yard or two.

A two-time consensus all-America selection as a guard and linebacker, Joe Romig received more votes than any other lineman for the Heisman Trophy and contested Merlin Olsen for the Outland Trophy. The team captain earned all-Big Eight Conference honors three years and was selected a National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame scholar athlete, establishing a 3.900 grade-point average, majoring in physics. That Hall of Fame dinner must have been an exciting evening 25 years ago with Alex Kroll, Merlin Olsen and Joe Romig receiving scholar athlete awards and the late President John F. Kennedy receiving the Gold Medal Award.

As a Rhodes scholar, Joe Romig earned an advanced degree in Physics from Oxford University and then a doctorate in astrophysics from the University of Colorado. I can barely pronounce it. He passed it with a 3.900 grade-point average. Joe is engaged in theoretical research for Radio-Physics, Incorporated. He and his colleagues at the Boulder-based firm are responsible for one of the 11 experiments being conducted by the Voyager.

He is past-chair of the Mental Health Association of Colorado; he is actively involved in the American Advancement of Science and the New York Academy of Sciences and teaches Astrology at the University of Colorado.

Joe Romig will receive his award from the director of athletics at the University of Colorado, Bill Marolt.

Wilma Rudolph, Tennessee State University, Track.

When most sports historians engage in discussions about the greatest female athlete ever to impact American sports, the names of three women always seem to surface. One, of course, is Babe Didrickson Zaharias. The modern era is represented by Cheryl Miller, whom you honored earlier this afternoon. The other name, the first name, many would say, belongs to the only American woman ever to earn three gold medals in track and field in a single Olympiad, Wilma Rudolph.

She set a world record in the 100-meter dash and an Olympic standard in the 200-meter sprint in the 1960 Olympics in Rome, ending Australia's eight-year hold in the sprint championships. She also ran on the world record 400-meter relay team and was selected female athlete of the year in 1961. Wilma won a bronze medal in the 1966 Olympics.

Active in student government and a member of the student newspaper staff at Tennessee State University, she trained on a cinder track that was 140 yards shorter than regulation. She has been an outstanding high school basketball player and once scored a Tennessee State record 45 points in one game.

She is a member of the U.S. Olympic Hall of Fame and several other halls of fame and was presented a Golden Camera Award as one of the most outstanding athletes of the last three decades.

We spoke earlier of dealing with pressures and challenges. Few world-class athletes have overcome the childhood illnesses encountered by Wilma. She suffered from a series that included scarlet fever, double pneumonia and polio. She wore a leg brace until the age of nine.

She is founder and president of the Wilma Rudolph Foundation, a not-for-profit, amateur athletics and educational program. She has served as a special consultant for the Tennessee Department of Economic and Community Development and is a consultant on education, sports and youth programs.

Wilma is a popular lecturer and talk-show personality and was a television commentator during the 1984 Olympics. She also directed an Olympic experience film and hosted a television public-affairs program. Her autobiography "Wilma" became a best-seller. She is the chair of the United Negro College Fund and serves on the Executive Committee of Artists and Athletes Against Apartheid. She was selected National Mother of the Year in 1981.

A legendary Wilma Rudolph will receive her award from Tennessee State University's vice-president of academic affairs, Bernard G. Crowell.

Now, responding on behalf of the Silver Anniversary Honorees is that 15-year professional football veteran, Merlin Olsen.

Merlin Olsen (Utah State University): A number of years ago, a young mother took her eight-year-old son and sat him down on her knee and asked him a very serious question. She said, "What do you want to do when you get big?" He smiled and responded very quickly and positively, "Big is what I want to be, and I also want to be an athlete."

The mother was stopped suddenly because she had to explain reality to the young man. She said, "Well, son, growing big is not something that is in your genes. Your two grandmothers are 5-1 and 4-11. Your grandfathers are both 5-7. Your father is only 5-10½. You really cannot expect to be big, but you can work to be an athlete."

The young man was encouraged and went out for every team he could possibly try out for and was cut as soon as he walked onto the field or into the gymnasium. He was successful in growing a little bit, although he did not grow rapidly enough to suit himself and was never really the biggest or near the biggest in his class. Finally, as he got into the ninth grade, his coach there, who was given the assignment of cutting him from the basketball team, pulled him aside and in all sympathy and compassion said, "Young man, why don't you go and use your energy on something more easily attainable? Why don't you use your skills to go and work on the school paper or get involved in a play or work on the yearbook?" He said, "You know, our job here as coaches is to develop athletes, and you are never going to be an athlete."

I have often wondered how different my life would have been if I had listened to that coach. (Laughter) If I had been able to give up my dream, I certainly would not be here today responding on behalf of this outstanding silver anniversary class. Dreams are important at every stage of our lives, and you can imagine the number of dreams that have been dreamed by the young awardees here today and those of us on the other side of the dais and how many of those dreams happily have come to fruition and reality.

I am really honored to respond for our group, which includes the first woman, Wilma Rudolph, to win this award, and certainly enough political clout and enough muscle to handle ourselves in most any situation.

It would be wrong at this point not to offer some thanks to those who helped to make it all possible. Certainly, to our families; our spouses, who have been with us on the bad days as well as the good days; to our universi-

ties; athletics directors; coaches; presidents; teammates; friends; professors; advisors, and all of whom have helped us to be where we are today.

You know, if I look a little tired, it is because I had to stay up all night working on these flowers. I hope you like them here. (Laughter) It is tough to get them all in the trunk of my car. (Laughter)

It is a little presumptuous to speak for such a group, but I would like to do that for just a moment. I think we all look back with great pleasure and excitement and enjoyment at our opportunity to compete in collegiate sports, but perhaps a better measure of that experience is what we managed to carry away with us. The knowledge of the importance of teamwork, the knowledge that certainly has sustained us in our many endeavors; the ability to take criticism, coachability, if you will; the recognition of the importance of preparation; a respect for some very old-fashioned qualities that lie at the heart of the success of most everyone in this room, hard work, determination, perseverance.

It is tremendously important to learn as an athlete, and it is somehow easier there than almost anywhere else, that we have this wonderful block of potential of which we have been blessed. To understand that, you can push mind and body beyond those easily recognizable barriers, a knowledge that helps us to open new horizons and to make room for new dreams.

In the 25 years since we have left our universities, there have been many changes. Certainly, the athletes have gotten bigger and stronger and faster and better looking in some cases. They also have found themselves in opportunities for greater and greater exposure. I am particularly pleased as a father of two daughters to see the growth and development of athletics, women athletics in particular, and the opportunities available to them.

There are certainly more dollars available today, but never enough dollars. I know you are concerned for fiscal responsibility in terms of your responsibilities at your universities. We are saddened, I think, that there are still campuses where student-athletes become part-time professionals. College sports, college athletics programs, are not the minor league of professional sports and never should be. It angers us, I think, that there are still places where athletes are taken by the hand and led comfortably around an academic experience. We salute you for "Proposition No. 48" and applaud those who are seeking higher standards and endorsement on these academic standards.

We really do get what we expect and what we demand of college athletes. There are those who are really worried about the gifted athlete who doesn't want to be a student. I think those athletes will take care of themselves. I am more worried about the scholar-athlete who needs the scholarship, who can use that opportunity, who is denied the opportunity because someone is there who just wants to be an athlete and doesn't care about the academic side of that responsibility.

We salute you for what you have done in drug testing. You have sent a powerful message, one that I am sad to say has not been sent as well by those of us who are part of the professional game. I am sure that watching some of the gifted athletes have to sit out these bowl games will send its own message to those who will follow behind them. I urge you and we urge you collectively to continue on that road.

We would thank you collectively for this great honor that you have bestowed upon us. It is exciting to get together with this group of outstand-

ing people whom I have had a chance to share many memories of the past over this short time.

In leaving you, I would tell you that one of the things that I have always been aware of, and you feel it today particularly with this group of honorees, is that there are special qualities that allow them to take that step up above the masses. There are two in particular that I would talk about as I would leave you. One is an ability to generate a special kind of concentration, to focus all of the physical and mental and spiritual and emotional energy to bring all of that together at one point in time to make things happen with intensity. You feel it in these honorees, these special people. I know you feel it in the other special people you work with.

You know, it is never enough to just be able to do that once in a while; because if you would really rise above a crowd, if you would be a great champion, you must also have something to go with that, consistency. You must be there on the bad days as well as the good days and on the days when it hurts. We had that in our class. We are proud of it, intensity and consistency.

Just as there are qualities on the positive side that separate great performances, there are some things you are not likely to find. Don Shula, the great coach of the Miami Dolphins, had just finished an undefeated season and was surrounded by all these trophies; and we had spent two days talking about the success, all of the dedication and planning, all of the different things that had gone into this. I finally said, "Coach, we have talked about all the positives. Are there any negatives, anything that really worries you?" He said, "One thing. I am afraid that we might forget how hard we worked to get where we are today. I am afraid of complacency."

Well, I think for each of us it might not be a bad idea to put those words in the back of our minds; because I don't think that any of us can afford to forget how hard we have worked to get where we are today and how hard we must work to get where we want to be tomorrow. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Rather: Thank you very much, Merlin. Congratulations to you and your outstanding qualities. Ladies and gentlemen, you have applauded generously and often, but before we leave this part of the program let's have another round of applause for all 12 of these honorees. Congratulations to each and every one of you.

Now, it is time for us to turn our attention to the focal point of each honors luncheon program, the presentation of the Theodore Roosevelt Award, the highest honor the Association bestows on an individual.

If you will open your program, you will see pictures of past winners of this award, which recognizes a distinguished citizen who, having earned a varsity athletic award in college, has exemplified ideals and purposes to which college athletics programs and amateur sports competitions are dedicated. It is a distinguished group, including, as you will note, former presidents and a vice-president of the United States, military leaders, pioneers in space and medicine, and educators. All truly have been worthy of this recognition.

We salute today a former student-athlete who formed a corporation here in San Diego about 36 years ago with a \$5,000 investment. Today, it is a \$332 million company with 4,500 employees. Walter Joseph Zable was a four-sport athlete at the College of William and Mary. He played basketball and baseball, was the Southern Conference low hurdles champion, and

was an honorable mention all-America and first team all-South Atlantic Football Player.

He earned his Bachelor of Science degree in 1937 and continued his graduate work at William and Mary and at the University of Florida, where he received his master's degree in physics and mathematics.

In 1951, he formed Cubic Corporation, a highly diversified electronics company that is considered an international leader in electronics development and computerized locomotion. Cubic's electronics programs are prevalent in many commuter rail services, and its computerized aviation tracking system is in effect in this country and abroad. Cubic also is one of the nation's foremost producers of geodetic and surveying systems, aerospace and data-handling systems and is an international supplier of digital and automation components to industry.

San Diego magazine has named him Industrialist of the Year, and the National Management Association honored him with its Gold Knight Award. He was elected San Diego's Man of the Year by the City of Hope's Executive Council. The San Diego Press Club named him the executive headliner of 1982, and that same year the California Manufacturers Association named him Manufacturer of the Year.

Walter is an enthusiastic supporter of the Junior Achievement Program and serves on the board of directors of the San Diego YMCA, the Museum of Man, and the Theater and Arts Foundation, among many other charitable organizations.

At William and Mary, he has served on the Endowment Board and the Alumni Society. He also is a member of the University of San Diego's Board of Trustees and is a member of the Board of Trustees for the University of California at San Diego Foundation and that university's Cancer Center.

Active in community and governmental affairs, he is a member of the governor's California Economic Development Board and holds directorships on a number of boards.

He was named to the Sports Illustrated Silver Anniversary all-America team and was inducted into William and Mary's Athletics Hall of Fame. He also received the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame Gold Medal Award, its highest recognition for athletics and humanitarian excellence and has been inducted into the College Football Hall of Fame.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my privilege to present to you, Mr. Walter Zable.

President Davis: Mr. Zable, recognizing your superb undergraduate career as a student and athlete and your continuing commitment to the highest personal standards, I am pleased to present to you the 1987 Theodore Roosevelt Award in recognition of your many contributions to international electronics development and computerized locomotion and your commitment to the spirit of private enterprise and civic responsibility. It is with great pleasure that I present this to you. (Applause)

Walter Zable: Thank you. I am a pretty old looking man here. (Laughter) I want to thank everybody for these kind words. It is something that you don't expect, and I might say as my good friend Sid Gilman, coach Gilman over there, says, "Merlin, you weren't too good of a ball player, not too bad." (Laughter)

I am sorry to see that my friend Alexander had to leave a second, because we have a company in his area right there next to Nashville; and I am glad

that you voted, Senator Cohen, for the AWAC program. (Laughter)

I am glad to see a major in physics and math receiving awards of this type. I sure appreciate it. I also want to thank Hayes Watkins, chairman of the board of CFX, actually in bringing a whole bunch of people from Virginia here, some of my old friends. I just don't know how to thank you for doing something like that. He picked up a couple of people actually in Dallas, Texas, and also in Austin, Texas.

Also my president over here of William and Mary, who is a new president for William and Mary, an ex-William and Mary man, I want to thank you very, very much for the kindness that you have given me in this particular honor. It is something that is really hard to imagine. I have to stutter over it even.

In fact, Mr. Rather, and NCAA leaders and benefactors, distinguished athletes, it is fantastic, really. You know, if you are fortunate enough to have a long life as I have and to try to do many things and succeed at a few of them; well, in all honesty you do hope that somebody will pat you on the back sometime and say that was a good job. But today the NCAA has done me far more honor than I have ever expected would come my way. I am not sure that I deserve it, and God grant that I will never be sure I deserved it. I am sure that I will be motivated more than ever to live up to the principle of this Theodore Roosevelt Award.

As I say, any American really, and I don't care who he or she is, would be as humble as I am to join the company of recipients of the Theodore Roosevelt Award. For that humility and motivation, I thank the NCAA with all my sincerity. What a wonderful holiday present for an old jock to receive, especially in my hometown.

I said, "You picked me because I am in San Diego." They corrected me and said, "No, last year you were first, but President Reagan was involved in this thing, so Vice-President Bush got it." (Laughter)

Well, it is beautiful in my hometown; and I am sorry the weather is not as good as it should be, but we do need the rain. You know when I mention old, I mean old. I go back to the 1930s when the players played both ways. If you came out in the quarter, you couldn't return in the same quarter. So if you were dying, but you could play, you would play.

There are only a few of us who still have our front teeth, because no mouthpiece was worn, nor did we have face protectors. That was a sissy. In fact, I heard someone say, "Hell, in those days you didn't even wear a helmet." Well, we did wear helmets. In those days, when you finished college, you were given a chance to play pro ball with offers of great salaries like \$75 if you were lucky, to \$150 a game. I think Sid Gilman received \$100 a game. I am not sure.

You had a future that was not too enticing after your football days were over. You know, the love of football makes one find a way to participate in the sport and continue to improve one's education and take graduate courses like I did. In my case, I was able to do both by playing with the Richmond, Virginia, team and continuing graduate work at William and Mary. In fact, this league had some pretty good ball players, especially during World War II when many of the National Football League players were in the service.

Now, I was just recently at the Football Hall of Fame dinner in New York last December with our chairman of the board here, Vince Stratte. I was

kidding an NFL old timer, an all-star name Riley Smith, who was a blocking back in the backfield that included two other all-star players for the Washington Redskins named Sammie Von Cliffut and Ernie Pickam. That is not a bad backfield. Everyone was an all-star. When we played the Redskins, I encountered Riley Smith trying to block me by holding. So many years later, in fact two years ago in New York, I said, "Riley, you know, your fame comes from holding." He replied, "Is there a better way?" (Laughter)

I will tell you that football and other sports were good to me. During the depression years, it provided me with an education and many laughs; and let no one say it doesn't build character. I applaud the NCAA for establishing a high standard for the athletes to follow.

It is a shame that some athletes penalize themselves by not following the NCAA standards. It is refreshing to see many of the coaches preaching to the athletes to get a good education, because we all know what happens to many who have neglected their education after their professional days are over. I know what it means to get a good education; and without it, I would not have had the tools to build Cubic Corporation to the position established presently. I have to thank sports immensely for my successes. Without sports, I would not have had an education; and without an education, God knows what would have happened to my career.

I thank the College of William and Mary, especially a fellow named Mr. Vern Nunn, who had operation of the money, who looked over many of the William and Mary students whom he thought had potential. I also want to thank the committee who made it possible for me to receive this Theodore Roosevelt Award. Thank you very, very much. (Applause)

President Davis: Thank you, Walter. Now, I am pleased to present the Institutional Plaque to Paul Verkuil, the president of the College of William and Mary. This plaque commemorates the selection of one of the university's distinguished alumni as the recipient of the 1987 Theodore Roosevelt Award. (Applause)

Mr. Rather: Congratulations. Merlin, I know you will not take it too seriously about what he said about Sid Gilman. I know the inside story on that, and I don't think you will mind if I share it. Coach Gilman, one of the greatest who ever coached, always considered defense and the running game right up there with sin and Communism. Merlin made the mistake one day of trying to discuss defense and the running game with him. So you should know not to take too seriously coach Gilman's downgrading of wonderful accomplishments. (Laughter)

If you will give me just a second, I will make sure we have not left anything out. If there is anything worse than not being on time, it is leaving something out. As best as I can make out, we have not left anything out.

I have enjoyed greatly the opportunity to be with you here today. I want to thank you for including me in these festivities. Again, my congratulations to the honorees. I want to thank the NCAA for inviting me to participate in the program. This affair, I have no doubt, long will be remembered and cherished by everybody in the room who attended it. I am pleased I could have a small part in that salute to the accomplishments and exemplary role-models that have been established by those whom you have honored with these awards.

I congratulate each of the honorees, and again my congratulations to

Walter Byers for his 35 years of wonderful accomplishments. I want to congratulate each person in this room associated with the NCAA for accepting the challenge of a sincere rededication to what the NCAA has always stood for and symbolized — the product of intercollegiate athletics when it is truly conducted as a part of higher education and the American experiment. Thank you very much. (Applause)

President Davis: Thank you, Dan, for sharing this day with us. As a token of our appreciation for your serving us so ably here today and to remind you of the admiration and respect our Association holds for you, I am pleased to present to you this token of our esteem.

Mr. Rather: Thank you very much. It is very beautiful. Thank you very much, one and all.

President Davis: He is a handsome addition to the dais, but not as beautiful as Diane Sawyer. You have done good anyway, Dan. (Laughter)

This has been a great day. I congratulate each of the honorees and thank you and your families for contributing to the prestige and the quality of our Convention. In closing our program, I remind you that most conference meetings will resume at 2:00 p.m. We will begin the division business sessions at 8:00 a.m. tomorrow. Now, if you will please rise, Father Glynn will offer the benediction.

Reverend Glynn: Let us pray. Almighty God, we thank You for the beauty and goodness of this day and this hour and the beauty and goodness of the lives of the men and women we have honored this afternoon. We thank You for the gifts that have come into our world, the gifts that You have granted to our award recipients. We are especially grateful for the excellence of their achievements, the examples of commitment and community service manifested by their lives and for the inspiration they are and have been to us and to millions of others. In gratitude to them, we ask Your continuing blessings upon our honorees and their families. All this we ask of Your goodness. Amen.

DIVISION I-A BUSINESS SESSION

Thursday Morning, January 8, 1987

The Division I-A business session was called to order at 8:00 a.m., with Chair Wilford S. Bailey presiding.

Wilford S. Bailey (Auburn University): Will you, please, take your seats so that we can begin our session. It is time for us to convene the Division I-A business session for this Convention. There are two or three comments with regard to our agenda and our procedures that I would like to bring to your attention.

First of all, I call your attention to a portion of the program that sets forth our agenda, pages v and vii, which has the agenda for our business session that we will begin in just a few minutes. We will begin with voting on legislation pertaining only to Division I-A and then review of other legislation affecting Division I and of particular interest, of course, the I-A membership. Then there will be review of other legislation of interest to Division I-A.

In those discussion sessions, there are other members of the Division I Steering Committee from Division I-A institutions and conferences who are in the audience, because there is not room at the head table here, who will be involved in responding to questions or making comments as we proceed with those items. You will find, then, on Page 101 in the blue page section near the back of the program the four proposals that were identified for action in our Division I-A session this morning. When we begin our business, these will be the four items that we will discuss first as indicated in the agenda. Then there are the 26 proposals on the agenda for Division I, with one addition that has been made, related to special consideration in the printing of the program. Many of those will be of great interest to us and will require some time for clarification.

I would urge as much discussion, raising of questions that you can this morning for clarification of the Division I items, because the agenda for Division I is very, very full this afternoon. In order to complete that, much of the discussion achieving clarification will need to be done this morning.

Then, as indicated, if there is time remaining we can review other proposals of interest to I-A membership. As in the past, the Convention publications are designed to enable us to use either the Official Notice or the Convention Program, the two documents that are prepared for the Convention: the one mailed to you earlier, and then the one received here, which is the formal Convention Program.

For Proposal No. 5, on Page 3, in Part A, the second line, the words "and the Administrative Committee" are to be deleted from the legislation. So in the Official Program, they now appear in italics and not as in the notice of the Convention.

For Proposal No. 40, on Page 23, this was recently referred to as the Fencing Committee in a couple of places, and it has now been corrected to specify the Golf Committee.

For Proposal No. 117, on Page 75, the voting line has been changed and has been corrected to say that this must be acted upon in a common vote of all divisions, not by Division II only. This change also is reflected in the Division II portion of Appendix A.

Finally, for Proposal No. 148, on Page 94, the final words in the last sentence were to be deleted so that they now appear in italics.

Please remember that for all voting, this session included, the voting paddle is necessary for the voting by member institution, allied conference and so forth. Our procedures dictate that all voting be done by paddle.

In keeping with the Association's practice for completeness and accuracy of the Convention Proceedings, the court reporter is here and will be preparing a transcript of this session, so we ask each individual to identify himself or herself and your institution or other affiliation whenever you speak.

Before we move to the formal agenda and take up the items identified for our consideration and action this morning, I call on Chancellor I. M. Heyman, University of California, Berkeley, on behalf of the Presidents Commission to make a few comments about the report of the Presidents Commission.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENTS COMMISSION

I. M. Heyman (University of California, Berkeley): I want to say a few things about the Presidents Commission and what we have been doing over the last two months of work following the October meeting of the Commission. The work has culminated in a set of resolutions that were considered yesterday at the Presidents Commission meeting. Those have been distributed or are available, and I really urge each of you to get a copy of those because I think that that is the meaningful product of the Presidents Commission. They relate to some of the things we will be doing at this Convention. It also bears a relationship obviously to the special Convention for June 29-30 that has been called by the Presidents Commission. Consequently, that document is of importance to all of us.

When I talked to the press yesterday following the Presidents Commission meeting, I urged the following. I think it is relevant to all of us here. From our perspective, those that are on the Presidents Commission, we see ourselves as having devoted ourselves mainly so far to working on integrity issues, largely picking up the lead from the American Council on Education and working with Proposal No. 48 and academic eligibility and being very interested in both eligibility for young people coming into school and the maintenance of eligibility through satisfactory progress once they are there. In other words, to try to be the depository, or one of the depositories in this Association, for looking at and trying to act in relationship to academic qualifications.

The other matter that we spent a lot of time with, as you will all recall, is our enforcement processes, making them as effective as possible.

We are now turning to another area, and that is as we conceptualize it, the establishment and the maintenance of a proper balance between intercollegiate athletics today as they appear in many ways on our campuses and the other programs of the institution. I will tell you how we got into this. We got into this because the set of suggestions that had come from the ACE committee that Chuck Young had chaired, that was a group of people that met and only had the opportunity to meet briefly in the fall. They came up with a series of recommendations to think about, and we started to internalize those and realized that what we were really talking about or really the way to think about what we were talking about was balancing — bal-

ancing at institutions between varying programs.

It became clear to us as we thought about this that the balancing of programs at institutions is primarily the responsibility of the president or the chancellor of the institution. There are a lot of other people that can be very helpful, and there are a lot of constituents that deserve more accommodation with respect to their interests. In the end, it is the presidents and chancellors who have to deal with balancing their institutions programs. I can give you examples that are not within athletics that we all understand perfectly well.

We have to deal with both those who are pushing very hard for graduate education and undergraduate education. We have to deal with both the interactions and the collisions between teaching and research. If you think about the liberal arts curriculum, we have to deal with the problems of science and humanities, for instance, as ingredients in the curriculum as it emerges. Put aside intercollegiate athletics for the moment. At a campus like mine, perhaps those who really like to take over everything in terms of resources and the like would be those people in the physical sciences. My job is to make sure that all that gets modulated in a way so that the institution as a whole does the best job possible.

That just happens to be the functions of the presidents and chancellors. It seems to me and it seems to us that that is our function in relationship to the general governance of intercollegiate athletics. We play the role of trying to find those right balances. Here we are talking in terms of balances, I guess, between, if you look at it from the student's point of view, excellence in athletics on the one hand and the time to be nourished and to be fulfilled and to be broadened in an academic way.

If you look at the point of view of institutions, we are talking about expenditure of monies. Of course, that is different in different places, depending upon sources. But there are institutions among us who, if they are going to carry on really successful athletics programs, are going to have to use money that could well be used for other purposes.

It does not mean that it ought not to be used for athletics programs; but in the end, it is the chancellor or president who has to make the determination of how to distribute, how to allocate those funds.

On the other hand, all of us who are in the positions of presidents and chancellors find ourselves more and more involved in the problems than the opportunities of intercollegiate athletics. There is a real resource-allocation problem because there is only a finite amount of time not only for me but for the staffs that are in the central portion of the university.

Finally, and I just am giving examples here, if something goes wrong in any part of the university, it reflects upon all of the university. If somebody steals equipment in chemistry; and if that gets to a certain scale and is not dealt with in a way that is perceived to be effective and efficient, the reputation and thus the future success of the whole enterprise is affected by it. In the same sense, if we have an athletics program — and I certainly do not believe that this is widespread — but if we have an athletics program that is heated with corruption or tainted with behavior that is viewed by many as bad behavior, it affects us all. It affects the whole of the institution. What I really am trying to say is that the Presidents simply by the nature of their jobs have to play an effective role; and the issue is how to do it. Now, here is how we decided to do it. We decided as we learned about these things that it

is not a good idea for us to jump in at the detail level.

One of our problems, I must say in general, and I suspect this is true of others who are sitting in this room, is that one is faced with the book full of legislation that is making small changes or what appear to be highly technical changes. It is difficult, especially for us who are not doing this daily, to understand what the significance of any of the changes are because we do not understand the context within which proposals are stated. I would dare say that there are a number of people in this room who are not presidents and chancellors who have difficulty at least with some of the proposals that are brought forth for exactly the same set of reasons. Putting that aside, though, in terms of general matters of governance, we decided that we had the capacity and the responsibility to start our endeavors out by choosing some areas, really under the guidance of the ACE committee, our colleagues, many of whom are in this room, and to try to generalize from them and come up with a set of principles with respect to some areas of our operation.

You will read that document and see it relates to problems in recruiting, in compensation of coaches, in playing and practice seasons, in coaching staffs and the numbers of persons on coaching staffs, financial aid. We are attempting to try to struggle at the principle level but not at the specific level presently, to try to get some consensus with regard to attaining a consensus, which is what happened yesterday, and to now seek to prepare specific legislation related to those principles for the consideration of the Presidents Commission in April with the emerging agenda for the special Convention. What we propose to do in this interim period, which takes a heck of a lot of work, and it is deserved work, is to try to work out a fairly close relationship with others who are more knowledgeable about the specifics of intercollegiate athletics as we formulate and consider formulations of specific legislation.

Along those lines, the NCAA Council has appointed a committee that Gene Corrigan is chairing to help us. He and I chatted a bit the other day. We are going to try to make that a deep and ongoing relationship very soon so that we can be bathed in some greater realities with regard to these matters than otherwise would have occurred. Nevertheless, we believe that in the end, it is our responsibility, and it is our responsibility in this organization, to take on and work with the matters that come under that general title of balancing. Just to repeat one thing, we want to look at this thing more holistically than we have ever been able to do previously; and that is why we have started off with principles and not bulletins, principles but not specifics.

We want to get our chief executive officers involved, and the reason to get them involved is because they understand what is going on and approaching it this way is really an educational process also for our chief executive officers. Of course, we want to maximize the probabilities of the passage of meaningful legislation with respect to these principles; and we feel the way to do that is through a process somewhat akin to the process that preceded the last special Convention in which we come up with a limited list where we survey other CEOs and where a lot of education is going on previous to the special Convention. We hope that we are going to get the attendance, and we will work on getting the attendance of more CEOs than normally come to Conventions. That is the approach we are going to use.

I will finish this way, and it is really kind of a point of information. In getting to where we are, we concluded that a number of the matters that are on the agenda of the Convention would better be handled in the process that I have just described than to be considered singularly at the moment. Consequently, we have asked for the withdrawal of a number of proposals — and they appear in that resolution — that are coming before the Convention. Of the four that are coming before Division I-A this morning, we are asking for the withdrawal of Nos. 94 and 135. I am very fortunate, because 94 and 135 are proposed by the Pacific-10, my conference. After all, what can they do when I make this kind of request on a personal basis?

What we are going to do, and I hope this is the pattern of the others, is that the proponent, in this case 94, is going to seek to withdraw. I believe most of my colleagues in the Pac-10 think this is a better format, a better way to handle these concerns, to do it in the context of what I have just described than to do it presently in a more isolated way. If there is objection with respect to the withdrawal, I presume the objector will move the motion and will be getting a second; and then we will move to refer the matter to the Presidents Commission. That will permit debate obviously on whether or not there ought to be a reference, and then the matter will be settled.

I just wanted to tell you how we think it will be best to handle this procedurally, and I guess I really want to urge as a general matter that you accede to what we would desire because I do think, and I think you ought to consider as you think about the ramifications of all of this that (a) the kinds of legislation that will come out will probably be somewhat better because they will be viewed in a larger context than is possible when matters come before us this way and (b) that it might well be for those who are interested in the passage of these matters that you do handle them in the way I suggested. We did not seek to withdraw all of the matters that might be relevant to the principles that we adopted. There are about five or six, maybe seven or eight Council matters, especially in compensation of coaches and in recruiting, that we thought in themselves were — we really agreed with them, and in our view are — going in exactly the right direction. Consequently, you will find that those are still on the agenda from our point of view. Obviously, everything is on the agenda until the body takes an action. I guess that is my way of informing everybody about what we did on the Presidents Commission and what we intend to try to do here.

Mr. Bailey: Thank you, Chancellor Heyman. I am sure I speak for the membership in Division I-A in expressing our appreciation to the Presidents Commission for the work you have done in bringing us to this point and for the plans that you have. I think you have expressed quite well the strategy, and that is understood by everyone as we move into our agenda this morning. I think I would be remiss, given Chancellor Heyman's comments, if I did not emphasize the sincere desire and commitment on behalf of the Council, and working specifically through the Special Council Subcommittee chaired by Gene Corrigan to which he referred, to work as vigorously as possible in every way to assist the Presidents Commission in the very tight schedule between now and the meeting of the Commission in April, in preparation for the June Convention and achieving the goals that have been set forth in these principles. We assure you of our every effort, Chancellor Heyman, to do whatever we can to provide the resources that are needed for the most meaningful legislation that can be brought forward

in the June meeting on these important topics.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Mr. Bailey: We come now to our formal session on the agenda for the identified topics, and the first item, the first proposal for consideration, is No. 94.

Financial Aid

Thomas C. Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): I have one point to add to what Chancellor Heyman just said. In the spring, because Dave Maggard of the Council was in charge of a Council cost-cutting committee and because of Chancellor Heyman's actions on the Presidents Commission, we developed a number of cost-cutting measures and they are before you in the book. It wasn't until the Commission got here that it was finally determined that it wanted to take on all this area itself. In keeping with Chancellor Heyman's remarks, I will withdraw this proposal at this time.

Mr. Bailey: You have the proposal to withdraw Amendment No. 94. Is there any objection?

Homer C. Rice (Georgia Institute of Technology): The Division I-A directors of athletics met in Chicago and went over all the proposals before us today, and we selected several that we want to support at this time. Therefore, I challenge that withdrawal and would like to support this proposal and have it put on the floor at this time. Therefore, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 94.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Hansen: I move that we refer this proposal to the Presidents Commission.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Bailey: There is a motion that has been made to refer this proposal to the Presidents Commission. The motion to refer is debatable. The discussion in that debate should address specifically the matter of referral, recognizing, of course, that the merit of referral impinges on the substance of the proposal to a degree. It is a difficult line to draw; and certainly, we want to be fair in every respect and fair in the discussion and the debate to refer.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I believe it is the appropriate time to discuss this issue. I thought it was a well-thought-out proposal and not only by the Pac-10 at the time it was proposed, but by the athletics directors. It addresses a very significant issue, and it relates to the run-off situation with regard to scholarships regardless of what later legislation might be proposed. I think it speaks to a very strong issue that has always been on the surface of intercollegiate athletics, and this comes very close to that with a 25-95 limitation. I think it is an excellent piece of legislation. We should not refer it but should approve it later this morning.

Mr. Heyman (University of California, Berkeley): It is very obvious for me not to oppose this on the merits. I do not. What I do ask you, and really what I asked you when I was up in the front there is that we look at this issue, the issues that are raised by 94 in a broader context, and that we look at them in relationship to a number of aid issues, that we try to work out a more general philosophy that is going to guide us with regard to these matters. It might well be that this will come back in exactly this form at the June special Convention; but as I say, it most probably will come back in a context that is broader than simply this in itself. That was the basis for our

request for withdrawal and our reference, and that is my reason for asking you to vote for this motion.

Mr. Rice: I think that if we are waiting for the June meeting on this, it makes it very late for considerations in the recruiting processes of our coaches. I think it puts a burden on them and that this legislation should be approved because of the August 1 date. As Roy Kramer mentioned to us, this is a very important issue because of our coaches. They feel very strongly about this. It puts more emphasis on keeping the recruited student-athlete in the program and encourages a more selective recruiting process and more considerations to the student-athletes on their academic performance as well as their athletics skills. We feel very strongly that this is an issue that we want to pass at this time, so we can make our coaches be aware of it as much in advance as possible.

Ferdinand A. Geiger (Stanford University): I would just point out to Mr. Rice that the effective date is August 1988, not 1987. I do not think a postponement of this for consideration until June will really have that much effect.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 94 to the Presidents Commission was defeated (40-51).]

Mr. Rice: Chair Bailey, let me make it clear we are not in opposition to what the Presidents Commission wants to study in this. We are all for this Commission, and we want to aid in any way we can. We just believe we have a few proposals that we feel are very important to move at this time. So we are very much in favor of this and will ask you to support this legislation at this time. We will be glad to help the presidents in any way possible in their meeting in June.

[Proposal No. 94 (Page A-70) was approved by Division I-A.]

[Proposal No. 109 (Page A-79) was ruled out of order.]

[Proposal No. 135 (Page A-97) was withdrawn.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Mr. Bailey: That completes the formal action agenda items. We can turn now to the items on the Division I agenda for this afternoon, and I would urge you again to please raise questions for clarification, make points that you would like because of the limited time that will be available this afternoon. It seems that the most efficient way to accomplish this is to go down the list of proposals to see those that you wish to discuss and on which you desire to raise questions.

Presidents Commission Grouping

Mr. Bailey: Proposal No. 47 was submitted by the Council and is the work of the Special Council Subcommittee to Review the Recruiting Process. Mr. Witte, from the University of Arkansas, chaired this committee.

Albert M. Witte (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): Mr. Bailey, with regard to No. 47, the division might be interested in a bit of background. Four years ago, the Convention adopted a proposal to ban representatives of athletics interests from off-campus recruiting; and there were concerns expressed at that time about enforceability and other issues regarding that ban. We have had four years of experience with the ban of off-campus use of boosters, and it seems to have worked well. Our committee and the Council did not detect any change of mind with regard to that issue. We think this would be a very positive step if we enlarged the ban to

the use of representatives or boosters in all phases of recruiting prospective student-athletes.

Now, this issue was before the Convention a year ago; and at that time, concerns were expressed regarding this idea. But we think we have addressed those concerns; and if the division will indulge me on this, let me just give our reasoning for supporting No. 47 and urging your support. First of all, with regard to enforceability:

We recognize that there are difficulties. But, nevertheless, we have heard from many, many coaches; and they seem unanimous in wanting this legislation. We believe that they want this legislation because it will provide them with a mechanism for excluding boosters from all phases of recruiting. In other words, the coaches will apply and enforce this provision; and we think that will be a very valuable step.

There are also concerns about excluding representatives of the institution's interests from legitimate recruiting uses and participation. When you get a chance to study Case No. 199 in your Manual, I think you will see that we can protect the legitimate use of institutional representatives through adopting the principles in Case No. 199. Briefly, they are two. First of all, Case No. 199 deals with the situation of off-campus use of boosters; and it would be extended to the entire subject. It permits the neighbor, the family friend, to have contacts with the prospective student-athlete; and it also permits boosters to be part of the institution's overall admissions program for recruiting all students, not simply athletes.

So we think with those concerns addressed, No. 47 is a valuable improvement, and we urge your support.

Mr. Heyman: I just want to say the Presidents Commission supported this, and I do want to say that for I-A this makes a lot of sense. For I-A and I-AA, we are going to have a little problem when we meet this afternoon, because it is very understandable that some of those schools really integrate their alumni in so much of their activity, admissions and otherwise, so that the interpretation of 199 is crucial to them. I am glad you said it here, and we ought to repeat it this afternoon, because that is where the problems will come.

Mr. Bailey: Thank you very much. With respect to the point that Chancellor Heyman just made, at least one member of Mr. Witte's committee is meeting this morning with I-AA and another member, I believe, with I-AAA to try to address the points that have been made here and to allay concerns and answer questions about it.

Daniel G. Gibbens (University of Oklahoma): I have a couple of additional questions for the general body. In terms not of the thrust of the legislation, with which we agree, but as I understand the definition of representatives of athletics interests, and I don't think Case No. 199 speaks to this, literally the language would cover our student-athletes, would prohibit them literally. I know we do not intend this when they act as student hosts when the prospects are on campus. So I think that we would understand that we do not mean to restrict our student-athletes in being student hosts, and I think that ought to be made explicit.

Similarly, I think that we all know that some recruiting takes place by fellow high school students, and ordinarily we do not think of those as boosters. So if we call them boosters, it is a problem. If we talk about the definition of representatives of athletics interests, I think the fellow high

school students fall within the way we define that term.

Again, I think that the high school students, because they have been recruited by a particular university and want to assist in trying to get other friends of theirs to come to that university, are not boosters. These are two questions I would like to see laid to rest.

Mr. Bailey: I think that, too, is certainly appropriate; and the record shall show that on both points the interpretation you have articulated is correct. The Council has discussed this, and especially the first of those two — student-athletes who are serving as hosts, or students generally — certainly the student-athletes are not representatives of the athletics interests in the on-campus activities under this legislation.

We will move to No. 54, the Resolution on Freshman Eligibility.

John B. Slaughter (University of Maryland): One of the things we do least well, I think, in our society is to inform ourselves completely on significant issues prior to taking a position, a position that is sometimes of great polarization. Such is the case, I would suggest, on this question of freshman eligibility. There are those who believe as I do that there are sound reasons why one would want to prescribe most freshman athletes, particularly those in the revenue-producing sports of football and men's and women's basketball, from participating in an aggressive program of intercollegiate athletics prior to having an opportunity to become acclimated to college life, to be fully conversant with what it means to be a student.

There are others who feel quite strongly that there are excessive costs associated with going to freshman eligibility and reject the notion on that basis. I would suggest there are some scenarios that support either of those two occasions, but it is insufficient to use anecdotal evidence to change the rule certainly or even to maintain one where there are reasons to suggest that some modification may be necessary.

There is a considerably growing amount of interest in examining the question of freshman eligibility. Proposal No. 54 before this body really was suggested to provide an opportunity to get a sense of the Convention on the question of freshman eligibility. I am proposing that it be withdrawn. I have discussed this with the sponsors of the proposal, with the exception of one; and they concur that it be withdrawn in with the proviso that the Presidents Commission conduct a more substantive study on the question of freshman eligibility than has been conducted in the recent past. Even the authors of the study that many people refer to as a rationale as to why freshmen should remain eligible in basketball and football, indicate a number of questions were not asked; and those need to be determined in order to make a truly definitive determination.

I am suggesting that the Presidents Commission take the responsibility for asking those questions and answering them; and if the results and findings of those questions prove the feasibility of freshman eligibility, then the Commission will be prepared, if and only if that is true, to present legislation in the form of a proposal or proposals that can be brought before the special Convention in June.

Mr. Bailey: Thank you very much, Chancellor Slaughter. The proposal to withdraw will be a matter of action at the Division I meeting this afternoon since it is on that agenda. Are there comments or questions about No. 62?

Gwendolyn Norrell (Michigan State University): Those of you here

probably will hear me give the same speech this afternoon. I would urge that you consider voting against this proposal and vote for No. 73. If you try to design research to be conducted over a period of years, you want a good tight design. I think this one is too tight. I think that this offering inflates the graduation rate, so I would ask your consideration this afternoon in voting against it and give the NCAA Research Committee, which has researched on it, and the institutional research people time to make some recommendations to the Council.

Academics

Mr. Bailey: Now, No. 67 is sponsored by the Council.

Joan Cronan (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): I speak in favor of this because it simply helps our athletes to have one more testing after graduation and before July, but it also tightens up the ability for them to get eligible after July. So it will eliminate the people who have gone part-time the fall semester or fall quarter and then taken the test in October. It tightens up after July but allows one more testing for our student-athletes.

Robert F. Stiedel Jr. (University of California, Berkeley): When you look at this particular piece of legislation, the intent is perfectly clear. The language is clear, but a phrase "at the time of graduation from high school" has snuck in. I would like to find out if a freshman can be eligible on the basis of a corrected academic record, which correction occurs after the date of graduation?

Mr. Bailey: Do you refer to correction on courses taken or on test score?

Mr. Steidel: I have seen a lot of transcripts and a lot do not get corrected between the time of graduation and the time they arrive on campus. I want to know whether this phrase "at the time of graduation" is explicit or whether a change in the transcript, if it comes after the time of graduation, can be honored?

Mr. Bailey: I will respond in this way: an authorized correction, and appropriately authorized by the designated high school official with regard to the courses or appropriately authorized with respect to the testing agency, would be acceptable.

Daniel B. Gibbons (University of Oklahoma): Joan may have answered this, but I want to ask and make sure. This is back on the testing part. Assume that the student-athlete graduates in late spring and does not have the requisite test score and is thinking about maybe working for a while or staying out of college for a while, deferring college, to see if he or she can get the requisite score in the fall test and assume that he or she gets the requisite score in the fall test and then decides to come to college for the second semester or the spring semester. Does this mean that that person will not be eligible under 5-1-(j)?

Mr. Bailey: That person would not be eligible if the individual enrolled full-time in the second semester, would not be eligible under the following activity here: If the individual enrolls part-time and in keeping with traditional interpretation of enrollment, full-time regular student, the person could be part-time enrolled; but during that first academic year that would not count and would not be a start time on the five-year period. The individual would be eligible the following academic year and would have four years of eligibility in the five-year period from that point.

Frederick Hemke (Northwestern University): Mr. Chair, I should express to you that the Council has voted to oppose Proposal No. 69. The

Council consistently has supported taking the ACT or the SAT tests prior to any and all student-athlete, initial full-time collegiate enrollment and believes this proposal deals with a very short-term situation and creates, we believe, an inappropriate unequal situation. So because of its inherent inconsistency to the accepted procedures, the Council has voted to oppose it.

Mr. Bailey: Thank you for that information. Then I believe I am correct also that the Council is prepared to oppose No. 68 that we just passed over for different reasons. The Council does plan to oppose both of those. Hearing no other question or comment, we will move to No. 70.

Robert A. Stein (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): This is a Big Ten Conference proposal. You may recognize it. It has been here on some occasions in the past, and we have taken some comfort from the fact that it seems to have gained support on prior occasions when it has been considered. We hope that you will study it carefully and when it comes before us this afternoon be prepared to approve it.

We feel quite strongly that this is an opportunity to make a statement very strongly in support of the concern about the academic progress towards the degree. The NCAA already has quantitative academic-progress requirements in terms of accumulation of credits, and what No. 70 would do is to impose additional qualitative requirements in terms of progress towards a degree.

We believe that unless a student realistically has achieved a grade-point average of this level, that true progress towards a degree is not being maintained. I did want to take this opportunity to respond to some concerns that I know have been expressed in the past in regard to discussions of varying grading schedules. Indeed, some institutions may have no grading schedule at all. We have had experience with this requirement for a number of years in the Big Ten. Our institutions have very different grading scales. Not all of them are 4.000 scales, and it is quite workable to translate an institution's grading program to a qualitative requirement such as this. If there are some institutions that do not have grades, we think an accommodation can be made for that. There is a delayed effective date to address some of these issues. So we hope that you will support it.

Richard D. Mochrie (North Carolina State University): I would have to speak in opposition to this primarily because I think the grading differs so much from one institution to another, and it is really the prerogative of an institution to define what satisfactory progress is. It is certainly not consistent across the country from one institution to another.

Mr. Bailey: We move to No. 73.

Gwendolyn Norrell (Michigan State University): I would hope that you would vote for this proposal because it gives the Council a great deal of flexibility to look at a variety of research designs so that we can come up with the best one we can.

Mr. Bailey: No. 74 on Recruiting Contacts.

Albert M. Witte (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): Two points might be made, one of which I am not sure I am the best qualified person to make. First, the question was raised as to whether men's and women's basketball would be treated separately for purposes of No. 74; and the answer is yes. They would be treated as separate sports. They will be governed accordingly.

The other point, where I am more hesitant, is that under current rules

the limitation is three; and this seemingly on the face of it would permit under the once-a-week visit an increase in the number of contacts. The reality is otherwise. In fact, under the current limit, contact of one kind or another far exceeds three. We learn that from all the coaches who are out recruiting in high schools. Therefore, when we adopted this once-a-week principle in football some time ago, the concern was expressed that this would increase the number. It has not worked that way.

It has worked the way of the intent; and that is, in fact, to decrease the number of opportunities. It has also aided enforcement of these contacts. We think that the same principle would be very valuable in the sport of basketball.

Mr. Bailey: On No. 76, I think it is appropriate for me to simply mention that after a great deal of discussion, the Council has agreed to oppose this on the two principle grounds; and I think that it perhaps is more appropriate to identify those and discuss those this afternoon.

Robert J. Skelton (Clemson University): One thing that the Council discussed quite a bit was the effect the initial Proposal No. 48 had on the work load at the high school level. A lot of admissions offices throughout the nation have received quite a few comments detrimental, I suppose, from high schools regarding the forms that they were asked to fill out for the core curriculum and satisfying the SAT or the ACT scores. So this year, the forms have been modified quite a bit to reduce that work load. I think this is to reduce this tension between the admissions offices and the high school guidance counselors and principals. The representatives of the National Principals Association worked with these to identify areas where they could reduce the work load. I think the tension has been abated and I would hope the group would defeat this proposal.

William J. Flynn (Boston College): I believe that Jack Kaiser of St. John's University (New York), who is in another meeting, will move that this be divided and that (i) and (ii) be separated and that (ii) be withdrawn. Then referring to (i), it is a question about whether the admissions director has something in hand that shows a student-athlete has at least eight core subjects and is taking three additional core subjects.

As far as it being difficult for the high school, as the previous speaker stated, the new NCAA rule requires that the admissions director of the university take on that responsibility; and it will no longer be the responsibility of the high school to determine if the student-athlete has 11 more subjects and has 700 on the SAT.

To me, I think that the Council misinterpreted the difficulty of this. It is merely that the admissions officer — not a coach going out and signing for the institution and having no knowledge that the individual will sign — that the admissions officer has some information that this individual has eight core subjects and is taking three others. Nothing else has to be done. It is merely that the admissions officer is able to say, if he is challenged, that he is able to prove that is a fact. It is not a very difficult situation; but the fact is that many youngsters may sign merely a National Letter of Intent, and they do not come any way near qualifying. One school is signing them, so the other school may not be able to have them at a later date. It does not mean that when the final signing date comes in February, that an institution can sign an individual who is not qualified.

Fred Jacoby (Southwest Athletic Conference): My personal view is that

the intention of this legislation is good; but I think in actual practice, it will be detrimental to the National Letter of Intent. I do not want any to negate or rule the letter null and void if the student does not meet the core curriculum or admission qualifications of the university. Also, for the early signing period of basketball, I think it literally would eliminate that early signing period because the test is taken in October and we may not have those results back. So I think the moving of the motion is well intended, and I agree with that; but it would eliminate, I think, the early signing period. We already have the mechanism in the letter to make it null and void if the student does not meet those qualifications.

Mr. Bailey: You may not have heard Mr. Flynn's first comment that they plan to ask for it to be divided and to eliminate (ii), which would eliminate the test score point relative to your last comment on October testing. So it would apply only to the core courses.

Mr. Jacoby: I guess my bottom line is the old cliché, if it is working why fix it.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I hate to argue with my good friend Mr. Jacoby. In establishing the core curriculum, what we are attempting to do is to reduce the number of embarrassing situations that occur where individuals are signed and then later they are not eligible. Certainly, the letter is good, we know that. But what we are attempting to do is to delay that signing for those individuals who obviously seem to be not qualified at the time of signing and, thereby, making it a more palatable situation, both for the institution later, if they have to announce that the individual is not qualified, and for the individual himself.

[Note: There were no further substantive comments regarding proposed amendments.]

[The Division I-A business session was adjourned at 9:30 a.m.]

DIVISION I-AA BUSINESS SESSION

Thursday Morning, January 8, 1987

The Division I-AA business session was called to order at 8 a.m., with Chair Jack V. Doland, McNeese State University, presiding.

Mr. Doland: Ladies and gentlemen, we would like to call the Division I-AA business session to order. And at this time, I will ask Ed Fort of the Presidents Commission, North Carolina A & T State University, to bring us a report from the Presidents Commission.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENTS COMMISSION

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A & T State University): Mr. Chair, we are going to attempt to do this in 30 minutes. That was the commitment that I made to the chair, and I certainly think we can do it. I was asked by Chancellor Ira Heyman, in his capacity as the Division I chair of our Presidents Commission, to serve as the spokesperson for our contingency as pertains to the background concerned with the goldenrod material that each of you should have before you.

My representations, as accompanied by inquiry from the floor, is subcategorized into two major portions. First, Mike asked me to give the body some information relative to precisely how we put this document together, what is the genesis of the goldenrod material, and then second, to highlight, with the use of the Convention packet that contains the various resolutions, the pages that are contained within the document itself.

So, let us go back to the top of the key and begin with first the background statement. I think, so as to avoid any misrepresentations, I am literally going to read the page and a half of material that we as members of the Division I contingency for the Presidents Commission, as accompanied by our colleagues in Divisions II and III, redefined yesterday overwhelmingly as the basis for this statement. The Presidents Commission, as far as we are concerned, has acted on the assumption that the CEOs of the colleges and universities ultimately have the responsibility for leading reform within the arena of intercollegiate athletics. Therefore, in leading that reform, the Commission has had two goals: No. 1, to ensure that intercollegiate athletics programs are conducted with integrity, and No. 2, to ensure that a proper balance is maintained between athletics programs and postsecondary education and other specific programs on those same campuses.

Now, to achieve the first goal, the Presidents Commission guided the passage of the NCAA legislation aimed at specifying the necessary academic qualifications of student athletes to obtain and maintain eligibility and, increasingly, institutions' specific penalties for violations of firm NCAA rules and institutionalizing prompt and fair practices to enforce those rules. Then, ladies and gentlemen, in October of 1986, the Presidents Commission initiated a series of steps to achieve goal No. 2. In October of the same year, last fall, at our Presidents Commission meeting, the chair of the Commission, John Slaughter from the University of Maryland, appointed an ad hoc committee of the Commission to assemble, and with the support of the NCAA staff, to develop a comprehensively defined program addressing the problem of institutional balance and emphasis for preliminary consideration by the Commission at this January 1987 meeting.

I served as a member of that ad hoc committee and on that basis and in

that capacity was asked by our chair, Mike Heyman, to bring this information forward to this group at this time. Now, that ad hoc committee — after reviewing the various and sundry issues and concerns — believes that in some institutions, overemphasis on intercollegiate athletics has led to the failure of said institutions to fulfill responsibilities to the so-called student-athletes and that some individuals abuse and even exploit high school and even junior college athletes. And that in some intercollegiate athletics programs, student-athletes are encouraged and required to spend perhaps an inordinate amount of their time practicing and preparing for the competition on the field.

The ad hoc committee, in the final analysis, believes that perhaps some coaches and other intercollegiate athletics personnel might even engage in acts that create, perhaps assumed if not implied, of conflict of interest between their institution's specific duties and responsibilities and their own personal and/or financial interests. The ad hoc committee further believes that many colleges' and universities' intercollegiate programs presently require an unwarranted expenditure of funds and thus prevent the support of other educational programs on those same campuses. Furthermore, the ad hoc committee believes that the presidents and chancellors of many colleges and universities share the belief that this assumed if not implied overemphasis, and the imbalance of same, has led to a deep erosion of public confidence in what we define as intercollegiate athletics.

In sum, the ad hoc committee believes that the serious imbalances that we think exist threaten not only the integrity of some athletics programs but also the integrity of the parent colleges and/or universities.

The ad hoc committee recommends that the Presidents Commission support the adoption of the NCAA member institutions' principles and policies that are aimed at maintaining appropriate and proper balance between intercollegiate athletics programs and other institutional programs on those campuses. Therefore, to achieve that end, that same ad hoc committee recommended that the Presidents Commission adopt for the record resolutions A and B and C and D and E and F in concert with the deliberations of that body — that body, again, ladies and gentlemen, being the ad hoc committee that was appointed by the Presidents Commission.

Additionally, we agreed yesterday as the Presidents Commission, overwhelmingly — that is, Divisions I, II and III — that in concert with our avowed intent to get the support of the entire Convention on Friday relative to the initiation and implementation of a 1987 special Convention in June, that we recommend that the Commission survey at the very least Division I presidents and chancellors for purposes of getting their clearly delineated views and opinions and concerns, if you will, as they pertain to the body politic and relationship to points A through F as articulated in the resolutions.

In summation, ladies and gentlemen, following the deliberations of our ad hoc committee, these representations were presented to the Commission yesterday; and following daylong discussions, the overwhelming consensus of the Presidents Commission, all three divisions inclusive, was that, in fact, the Presidents Commission go on record as supporting Resolutions A through F. The second charge given me was to share them with you very quickly, the basic intent of resolutions A through F.

Now, what I am going to do hurriedly is go through all of the numbers,

and then we will come back; and if there are questions from the floor, I certainly think that myself, other members of the Presidents Commission, and obviously the membership of the Council can field these and at least attempt to grapple with same.

You will notice, then, that as far as Resolution A is concerned, which specifically is concerned with the issue of the recruitment of student-athletes, the resolution contained in Paragraph No. 4 of that paper indicates that it is further resolved "... that the Presidents Commission recommends that sponsors of Proposal Nos. 75, 80, 81, 84 and 85 withdraw the proposed legislation so that the recruiting issues they raise may be addressed ..." on the basis of a comprehensive study. I will not go through all of them; and by the way, I have skipped deliberately through the withdrawals first because there might be more controversy. We will come back to the third paragraph, which relates to what we are asking that you support strongly in concert with the recommendations of the NCAA Council. Looking very quickly at just one, No. 75, which is concerned with — one of those that we're asking that the sponsors withdraw — the number of recruiting contacts that can be made by a university, specific personnel, in the field of football. And you will notice that the number is limited to three as a threshold. Rather than voting yes or no, or yes up or down, our suggestion is that we get the sponsors to agree to withdraw this legislation until such time as the Presidents Commission has an opportunity, following the inception of and the completion of a survey of the presidents and the chancellors, actually to develop an agenda that would cover that topic as a part of the June special Convention. Just one more for the record. No. 80 also is concerned with the issue of recruitment; and in this instance, basketball evaluation has become the topic.

We do not know specifically the precise mechanism that will be operational on the floor tomorrow as far as the withdrawal anticipation is concerned, but our hope is that the body politic will see fit to agree that in concert with Paragraph No. 4 of the first page, Resolution A, that Nos. 75, 80, 81, 84 and 85 will in fact be withdrawn on the floor of the Convention so that we can preserve these as topics for the proposed survey of the presidents and chancellors with the input from the athletics directors and the coaches and faculty representatives prior to the June special Convention.

Then, moving to the top, the third paragraph above that, we, of course, are supporting — in concert with the recommendations of the Council itself — Proposal Nos. 47, 48 and 49. For your information, 47, of course, concerns itself with the issue of recruiting contacts by so-called booster clubs. I certainly, as a member of the Council, feel very strongly about the need for support here. Of course, we anticipate that there will be members of our body through the Commission that will have something to say about the support for 47, 48 and 49 on the floor of the Convention tomorrow. So much, then, for Resolution A.

Let us move ahead quickly to B, C and D.

On Resolution B, which is concerned with the issue of compensation for coaches, you will note there that specifically we are resolving — that the pending legislation concerned with Nos. 50, 51, 52 and 53 are ones that we support strongly; and in concert with that support, we are urging your support of that with a yes vote tomorrow. They are concerned with coaches' compensation, with institutional endorsement, endorsement of funds and

personal compensation. So again, 50, 51, 52 and 53 are endorsed by the Presidents Commission based upon the recommendations of the ad hoc committee.

Resolution C is concerned with the issue of playing and practice seasons. There, if you will drop down to the second paragraph, you will note that we are taking a position in opposition to Proposal Nos. 127, 129 and 131. Let us take a real quick look at just one of them to save time. No. 127, you will notice, is concerned with the issue of postseason practice in women's basketball. And, of course, the issue there, among others, is: Why were we all making a dichotomy between male and female rules and regulations as they pertain to the practices under which women's basketball is governed? It's nonsense; and on that basis, we say no.

And then No. 129 is concerned with limitations on numbers of contests. And then, finally, No. 131 pertains to playing seasons as they relate to women's basketball. So again, we are urging that you say no with respect to the Presidents Commission position on Nos. 127, 129 and 131.

And then, finally, with regard to Resolution C, we are suggesting that the sponsors of Proposal Nos. 122 and 128 withdraw their proposals. We think it's better to get more of a feel from the body politic through the CEO's as to what in the world this all means through the survey and then grapple with these in some detail in June.

So again, No. 122 is concerned with limitations on playing seasons. No. 128 is concerned specifically with the issue of, again, limitations of numbers of contests within playing seasons; and so we are suggesting that we proceed with the withdrawal of those. We would ask that the NCAA Council subcommittee reviewing playing seasons, complete its work; and then by February of 1987, we would anticipate that some kind of liaison would occur between the Council and the Commission. On that basis, we would be able to have this in readiness for the session in June.

Resolution D is concerned with the size of coaching staffs. And if you'll flip through the pages with me again, you'll note that we are recommending that they be withdrawn. We support as a Presidents Commission Proposal Nos. 135, 136 and 138. No. 135, for example, is concerned with Division I-A only. No. 136 is concerned with sizes of basketball coaching staffs. And then No. 138 is concerned, again, the issue of basketball coaching staff sizes. And our suggestion is that we proceed with the issue of withdrawal there so that these issues can be raised with respect to the size of coaching staffs based upon the recommendations of the ad hoc committee.

Our hope is that, in concert with the input that we get from the presidential and chancellorship survey, that we can get sufficient data analyses completed so that we can decide precisely where we are on Nos. 135, 136 and 138 and therefore have that as principal if not major indices for our voting at or on a part of the June Convention. So, again, withdrawal is the concern for Nos. 135, 136 and 138.

We then move quickly to financial aid. That's a sticky one — Resolution E. And in that regard, you'll note that there is a long series of discussions concerned with the pros and cons. Again, to save time, flip over to page 4; and there we recommend that Proposals Nos. 45, 93, 94, 95 and 96 be withdrawn in deference to the results of the presidential- and chancellorship-based survey.

Let me just go through two of them to save time. No. 45 is concerned with

the issue of financial aid Pell Grants. And certainly, that one is going to be heavily debated. We think that that debate should be reserved for an appropriate time in June.

No. 93 is concerned with financial aid base limitations. Our request, again, is that there be a delay in that regard until we get more of a lay of the land in June. I personally oppose No. 93, but that's beside the point. Let's wait until June and see where we're going.

Finally, Resolution F and we're finished. Then we'll go back to the top of the key for questions or discussion or comments from the floor. Resolution F calls for the initiation of a special Convention. Now, you'll notice, ladies and gentlemen, that we are suggesting — the Presidents Commission agreed yesterday that if the floor of the Convention says yes — that this Convention would be held in Dallas on June 29-30. So you might want to mark that on your calendars. We feel that the critical issue with regard to this whole question of Convention as a special meeting, yes or no, is contained really in the first paragraph. After all is said and done, the CEO, in concert with input from athletic directors, faculty representatives, coaches, faculty at large and student athletes, has the ultimate responsibilities for ensuring that there is the implementation, advocacy and promulgation of appropriate balance between intercollegiate athletics and the rest of the programs on those campuses.

Therefore, there's no way that you can maintain the adequacy of that balance absent a comprehensively defined examination of the fiscal implications that that has for such balance. Therefore, why rush the judgment with regard to these fiscal implications by seeking to do them on a hurried basis here on Friday; when, in concert with our representations and recommendations, there are some that we feel deserve much more thought and much more study, much more data analysis. And on that basis, we're urging that the appropriate sponsors, particularly the Pac-10 and the Big 10, agree to make the appropriate motions on the floor so that those withdrawal mechanisms can be effected; and then on that basis, we can proceed with the vote for the special Convention in June.

Mr. Chair, that completes my summary. And on that basis, I think if there are questions that you might want to get into, we can seek at least to entertain those at this time.

Dave Waples (Gulf Star Conference): I have some problems with No. 52 on the coaching compensation, endorsement of funds. Let us just take a hypothetical situation, where the day after a ball game, a coach drives into a gas station, fills his car up and the gas station owner says, "Coach, great ball game last night." As he tries to pay with cash or credit card, the attendant says, "I'm not accepting any of your money." Coach drives away. He's in violation of this rule by the NCAA and his institution.

Mr. Doland: That has absolutely nothing to do with the administration of merchandise during practice or competition. That has nothing to do with it. He can get free gas anywhere he wants to.

Mr. Waples: It says, "... shall not accept, prior to receiving approval from the chief executive officer, compensation or gratuities of any kind whatsoever either directly or indirectly, excluding institutionally administered funds, from an athletics shoe, apparel or equipment manufacturer..."

Mr. Doland: It says "... in exchange for the use of such merchandise

during practice or competition . . ." It's for the shoe contract. It has nothing to do with free pizza or free gas.

Rick Taylor (Boston University): Coaches' outside compensation: do the presidents required all of their faculty members at their institutions to report all outside compensation consulting contracts?

Mr. Fort: They sure do with the two states in which I'm associated. That would be, in fact, three; my own state of Michigan.

Mr. Taylor: What about private schools? I don't think that's usually a consensus.

Mr. Fort: My response would be related strictly to public. For instance, in North Carolina, it's absolutely true. In fact, there is an ethics board.

Mr. Doland: Again, the last sentence, if they use it in practice or compensation for student athletes in the chemistry department, then I think it should be required; but if they're using it for other purposes, it's really not pertinent to this. We don't deal with the other faculty. We're interested in the NCAA-controlled athletes and faculty.

Mr. Taylor: I think there are a number of other chief executive officers who aren't treated here who are interested.

Mr. Doland: Our rules do not govern chemistry and physics.

Mr. Fort: Sir, I might make one additional comment to alleviate your concern in this area. The overwhelming consensus within the Presidents Commission was yes on this, and that includes a significant number of private institution presidents and chancellors. So it's not just public.

Gen. Sam S. Walker (Virginia Military Institute): I'll just make a gratuitous comment. For about three years, we've been looking at the reduction of playing seasons as an economics matter or cost-reduction matter. I believe the NCAA has studied this for two years now; and we have a reduction here. Any reduction at this time, in my estimation, would be favorable; and I don't understand why we continue to delay this matter.

Mr. Fort: That's a good observation. I think that one of the strong motivating factors, at least with regard to No. 127, is the line of demarcation that's been drawn between female and male athletics, which is unfair. But aside from that, this was discussed rather heartily within the Presidents Commission, both private and public institutions; and the overwhelming consensus was vote no on Nos. 122 and 128.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group Presidents): Regarding Resolution E, my only concern is that given how important that is and how much of an effect on the freshman-eligibility debate the financial aid decisions will have, that only two days of the June Convention does not seem like very much time for the Convention to go through the legislation that the Commission and the Council will be developing in the next six months. It just seems like we will not have adequate time in only a two-day meeting, not only to debate what will be before us in June, but to prepare for the freshman debate, which I expect will take place next January. And so it seems to me that as hard as it might be to think about it, maybe we ought to think about a three-day Convention in June to make sure that we have time not only to discuss proposals, but to change them and debate those changes before finally coming to a vote.

We learned when we dealt with drug testing for the first time, in January of 1985, that even the most thoroughly developed proposals sometimes required change on the floor. The lesson we learned then is that we needed

to wait an entire year, because we didn't have adequate time to change that very complex proposal.

And I think it would be a real shame if we did not give ourselves enough time in June and wound up with that same problem and either voted legislation we didn't like or wound up going home and not voting because we weren't, in the last analysis, ready to vote.

Mr. Fort: I did not mention this because it's not a part of the paper, but let me say this for the record. The other item, very important, that the Presidents Commission took an affirmative vote on yesterday was this: We are going to propose that the resolution concerned with the issue of freshman eligibility be deferred to the Presidents Commission with no reference to what it will do with it. That is, one must not assume that if in fact it's referred to the Commission, that the Commission will then draft appropriate legislation for a vote in January 1988. But the procedural point is that we will find specifically a mechanism on the floor of the Convention tomorrow whereby we will seek to withdraw the resolution and, in concert with that withdrawal, propose that it be deferred to the Commission for study. I'm talking strictly now about the eligibility issue. If that occurs, then it might very well be, Jeff, that your concern could be ameliorated by virtue of the fact that it's probably unlikely that much discussion on that issue would occur in June.

Harold H. Hall (Cornell University): I'd like to pose both a question and an observation. It appears that there's somewhat of a paradox occurring at this Convention. The Convention was changed to add an extra day to cover all the business and to give us more time to consider all of the issues; and since we've been here for a day and a half or two days or three days, whatever the case may be, depending on the number of committees you serve on, we've heard three things mentioned time after time. First one was, this proposal is out of order; the second one, this proposal is going to be withdrawn, and the third one, this proposal is going to be referred.

Now, it certainly appears when we add all those up together, that what we didn't need was an extra day to do what we could have done in one day less. And now when we hear this paper right here that talks about cost containment and the concern about the economics of intercollegiate athletics, a certain group has decided what we really need is another Convention. I really seriously raise the question: Are we not setting some type of precedent after having a special Convention in 1981, another special Convention in 1985 — are we now going to two Conventions a year? Are we going to two Conventions every other year? And I'm wondering how this fits in with the whole theme of cost containment.

Mr. Doland: On that note, we'll thank Ed Fort for his bringing us up to date on the Presidents Commission; and I would like to let you know that on a procedural basis, no one can withdraw — no conference or group can withdraw — one of these amendments if you don't wish it to be withdrawn. Any single member of this Association can request a vote on that amendment. So you have control of the Association, and you will be able to do whatever you wish on the vote. If you do not like to have certain things withdrawn — let's say, 96 or whatever — then all one voting delegate has to do is request a vote and a discussion on that issue, and it's no longer withdrawn.

Albert E. Smith (South Carolina State College): I have been associated with the NCAA for quite some time. I just wanted to make this comment as

a follow-up to the comment just before me. It appears to me that we have utilized some unnecessary time during this Convention; and I would hope that as we plan for the future, we would look at the formal format that we used at one time which brought us in around Sunday, and I think we left here around Wednesday or Thursday. I think it would be helpful. The other comment that I would like to make is that I know the importance of the presidents being involved in intercollegiate athletics. But at the same time, I hope that that involvement does not become too much.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Recruiting

Mr. Doland: The first proposals on my agenda for us to discuss will be Proposal Nos. 49 and 48.

Cecil W. Ingram (Florida State University): Thank you, Jack. I'm not here to influence anyone how to vote. I'm hopefully here just to explain the background by which these two pieces of legislation had their birth, so to speak. These are issues that the Presidents Commission has indicated that it wishes to discuss on an agenda in June. The Council divided up into four committees some six to eight months ago to cover these issues, one of the issues being recruiting. We were charged in this committee initially to proceed with the intercollegiate athletics programs with no evaluation and no recruiting. As you look at this and start thinking about swimming coaches looking into the use, and track coaches doing the same thing, and football and basketball coaches looking at tapes, and baseball coaches maybe having nothing to look at, and all down the line, we did need some evaluation and we did need some recruiting.

We began working on the premise of each sport having four months to do its recruiting. Presently, we may have 11 months of basketball evaluation and recruiting, 10½ months of football, other sports doing it on a 12-month basis; and so we felt like we'd try to compact the recruiting and evaluation process into a four-month period of time. By doing this, we felt that we could get with a football coaches' group and the basketball coaches' group from different levels to set for this Convention the period of time for an evaluation and recruiting.

In all the other sports, we have sent the necessary questionnaires and information to the sports committees for them to give us an idea of how they want to utilize their four months and vote on that at the 1988 meeting and put it into effect.

Going through this group, the timetable we've got to play football and basketball definitely is probably something that everybody in here would like to have changed in this way a little bit, or that way a little bit; but basically, we think we satisfied the vast majority. And my concluding statement about this is: We may not like it, but I feel that, from the coach's standpoint this is probably the best you're going to have to choose from if we let somebody else decide what your recruiting and evaluation period is going to be. You may like to do it over a 10- or 11-month period, but I think four months would be better than no evaluation and no recruiting at all. Without speaking on behalf of the specifics of the motion, I just wanted to get that information over on how we arrived at this particular point.

Mr. Doland: That's one that the Presidents Commission and the Council has requested a vote on at this Convention. Not to wait until Dallas. So this

is a question that will come up; and if you read Nos. 47, 48 and 49, you can make your decision at that time. I would say this: It's imperative that if I-A votes this in, that I-AA votes it in also, or we will have a problem with the situation.

Mr. Ingram: I think, too, if it's voted into football and not in basketball, or vice versa, I think it would be on the agenda, maybe in a different form, in June. I may add that the basketball coaches were very much interested in keeping their early signing period, and we honored that and tried to distribute their time where they would have recruiting and evaluation before early signing as well as late signing. The football coaches were not interested in the early signing. All the other sports will have the opportunity to register their opinion as to whether they would like an early or a late signing.

Barbara B. Hollmann (University of Montana): I would ask your support of one amendment, which is No. 49-1. All that that amendment does is substitutes a three-week time period in November for either the three-week time period in December or February. It doesn't make any difference. The only reason we're submitting that amendment is that in five states, high school girls play their basketball in the fall, starting in August and ending the first weekend in December. So for those evaluation periods in December and February, we wouldn't have anything to evaluate in those five states.

So we're asking that the November 8 to November 28 period be substituted in those states only.

Mr. Ingram: The Council last week voted to support this amendment because we were dealing with this problem earlier, and it's hard to do a few states differently than the rest of them. But the Council does support that amendment.

Mr. Doland: We'll go on with the agenda. We are discussing now financial aid limitations. If there are any problems with Nos. 44 or 45 or 46, then that is the issue that's first up for us to discuss. Two of these are roll-call votes. I believe they've been withdrawn; am I correct?

Sondra Norrell-Thomas (Howard University): I just wanted to make a comment that No. 45 has been withdrawn.

If it had stayed, it would have been moot if No. 44 passed.

Delegate: I just want to ask a couple of things for clarification. It's my understanding on No. 44 that if this proposal should pass, it really would not change the present financial aid package at this time. Am I correct there? Essentially, this is to move this from the constitution to the bylaws?

Mr. Doland: Right.

Delegate: Now, if it should pass, I'm a little concerned about the voting procedure in the future. If a proposal should come before the Convention, let's say, for example, to change the number of scholarships in football, what divisions or what groups would vote on a proposal to change in football? Would it be just Division I-AA and I-A?

Mr. Doland: They have that right now. Division I-A could increase or decrease the number of scholarships at this point. Now, we have a financial aid limitation on it. And I'll ask — did that stay intact?

G. E. Moran Jr. (Morehead State University): That came up last night in the Council; and the question was raised: If next year some additional aid was proposed, a stipend, or what have you, in football only, it would be a

total Division I vote but not a divided vote. Now, in some cases, you know, we vote I-A and I-AA; but this would be a total Division I vote, without a division between I-A and I-AA.

Marino H. Casem (Southern University, Baton Rouge): Does that mean that a Division I-A school could come in and increase the stipends to football players and not have Divisions II or III to vote against that?

Mr. Doland: Correct. They could decrease or increase.

Mr. Casem: But I-AA could vote for or against it?

Mr. Doland: Division I-AA could vote for or against it. And the \$900 Pell Grant remains intact, which was a problem in the past year. This has been up before. I've been on the Council four years now; and this has been up four years, so this is not a new proposition.

Mr. Orleans: At the university commissioners meeting the other night we discussed the issue raised about I-AA and I-A voting if No. 44 passes. The question that was put then was: Would it be possible for a proposal to come about which would make the amount of the award for grant aid different for I-A schools and I-AA schools and have that pass in a vote of the two groups voting as one group simply because there were more I-A votes than I-AA votes, and without regard whether or not the I-A schools are interested in doing that?

The answer that we heard was that if there were enough I-A votes to come up with a grant aid form that says grant aid is room, board, books, tuition and fees in a I-A school, and grant aid is worth \$3.22 at I-AA schools, that that could pass. It seems to me that it would be useful for us to have at least a staff answer or a Council answer on that, because we ought to clearly understand — not simply move it from the constitution to the bylaws for the three divisions. I think we really need to understand the implications within Division I for our two subdivisions quoting the definition of the financially related aid in the bylaws to be voted by us and the people that are meeting in that other room.

Mr. Doland: I don't think it's a question that can be answered. Yes, it could happen. If you want an opinion, no, it won't happen. We're working very closely with all the situations, and I don't think that any move — in fact, most of the I-A's are more interested in curtailing expenses than they are in increasing them.

Mr. Orleans: I would just hope that Chancellor Fort and Chancellor Thomas would take back to the Presidents Commission and the Council our hope that if No. 44 passes, it will not become a vehicle for the I-A schools to drastically increase the costs of grants and aid; but, rather, to try and use the grants and aid more reasonably to meet real educational expenses.

Bernard F. Cooper (Indiana State University): Could someone explain to me what's wrong with the way we're doing it and why this will be of benefit, No. 44? I would really appreciate that. No. 2, could we have a straw vote on it?

Mr. Doland: Well, let me make a brief explanation. There's been a concerted move by Division I-A to have autonomy. We have blocked the autonomy in this area. They have constantly wanted this; we have consistently said no. This will go on if we vote this down, to where they will continue to try to get autonomy in their division. Personally, I don't think it would affect I-AA. But you that do think it would affect it should vote no, and those that are concerned with it should vote no if you're worried about it. It

really is a matter of principle rather than action, and I sincerely believe that now.

John L. Toner (University of Connecticut): It seems to me that it's a good piece of legislation that we should remove from the constitution and place in the bylaws. But we're all asking a question. If we put it into the bylaws, then divisions could vote separate, one to another, about these limitations. Following that up one step further, we subdivided Division I into I-A and I-AA for football-only issues. So I think the questions that the Council ought to come back and tell us before we vote is simply that if you can decide by each of the three divisions what your future is going to be, isn't it consistent that you could divide Division I into a special accommodation for I-A, a special accommodation for I-AA and then a Division I accommodation for all of the other sports. Now, I don't know that that's fact, but it just seems to be reasonable. And I think the Council ought to let us know before we vote, because I'm thoroughly confused as to how I should vote if we don't answer that question.

John E. Thomas (Appalachian State University): I'm going to read about six paragraphs here which purport to be an objective view of proposal No. 44 here. Rather than editorialize on this, let me give you this report.

"The 1987 Convention Proposal No. 44, it should be noted, makes no change in the current financial aid limits set by the constitution. The subcommittee decided that it should recommend a proposal that did not alter the present restrictions so that the voters could focus on the principles involved rather than the specific financial aid limitations. The intent of the legislation is to provide each division, I, II or III, with the authority to determine independently its maximum permissible amount of financial assistance for an individual student-athlete. The subdivisions of Division I would not vote independently. In providing the independence, the legislation retains in the constitution part of the proposal an overall maximum limitation based on the quote cost of attendance at each institution and provides that any assistance above the current limits must be based on the determined need of the recipient.

"Cost of attendance is a term used by the Federal Department of Education in its regulations and by the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators and includes the elements of a current NCAA grant-in-aid, plus an allowance for a student's transportation costs and for miscellaneous personal expenses, including such items as clothing, laundry, toiletries and recreation. Among other things, part B of the proposal establishes in the constitution a requirement that any financial assistance beyond the current limits must be based on the demonstrated financial need of the recipient.

"If Proposal No. 44 is adopted, it will be necessary at a future Convention for the sponsors of any legislation that seek to increase the amount of financial aid to satisfy a majority of the voters in the appropriate division that their proposal adequately specifies the additional elements of cost of attendance that will be permitted, i.e., the cost of one round trip coach airline ticket home, or a specific amount per mile between the campus and the student-athlete's home, whichever is less, and the controls to be placed on the need calculation. NSFA has expressed a willingness to provide assistance in developing such specific requirements. Although the language of Part C appears complex, it does not change the current restrictions. It

merely removes from Constitution 3-4, the specific limitations on the maximum amount of financial aid a student-athlete can receive and places them in the same words in Bylaw 6, a divided bylaw. Again, the same restrictions were retained so that changes would not complicate the vote.

"For the past three Conventions, proposals to provide for divisional independence in controlling the maximum permissible amount of the financial aid have been defeated or referred. This proposal is an improvement on previous legislation, because it contains a maximum constitutional restriction based upon a known financial aid term, cost of attendance, and a requirement that any increase shall be based on need. Even without these protections, the concept has received majority support in the past, once falling only six votes short of the two-thirds majority needed for adoption."

I tallied this as being objective. I forgot about the subjective sentences in here. Somebody editorialized a bit in this report. This proposal does not treat the Pell Grant recipient differently than he or she is treated under the current rules. In other words, a student-athlete who qualifies for at least \$900 in Pell Grant funds could continue to receive the value of tuition and fees, room and board and books, plus \$900.

If changes in the treatment of Pell Grants are sought in future years, it will be necessary for the membership of the appropriate division to determine how they should be treated. At such time, it might be desirable to provide for all additional amounts permitted to Pell Grant recipients to be included in the overall divisional limit, along with any other additional aid permitted. In no event should the total amount of aid received by the student-athlete exceed the cost of attendance. If it does, in addition to the NCAA rule problems, an institution would face potential problems with a Federal audit.

"Further, a feature of Proposal No. 44 would permit a division to tailor its needs to more closely approximate the treatment of students generally. This would be the case inasmuch as the proposal limitations that are based on the cost of attendance for students enrolled in comparable programs and takes into consideration the student's financial need. This program does not increase costs. It provides for an opportunity for divisions to address financial aid limits independently.

"It is possible that a division could use this flexibility to further restrict financial aid. In any event, the increase would not go to all student-athletes but only to those who could show sufficient need. At the time any increase is proposed, its opponents could address concerns about additional expenses. The proposal does not restrict the source of funds for meeting any future financial aid limits any more than legislation does. In other words, the source of funds would not be a problem under the legislation so long as the funds are administered by the institution in accordance with the constitution."

Ladies and gentlemen, I served on the committee that put together this recommendation. There was recognition at the time that I-AA and other divisions might resist the autonomy for the reasons that our chair has already expressed.

John C. Martin (Delaware State College): My question is, does this open up a problem with other sports, with other athletes within your program who will be discriminated against with this particular legislation?

Mr. Thomas: It's my understanding that this would permit Division I to

make its own decisions regarding this, and it would not indicate that they would have to make any special provisions for football players, if that's the question you're asking. The Division I people that presented this pointed out that they were under some severe constraints themselves, that they couldn't be having a two-tiered kind of financial aid system. It simply takes it out of the constitution and means that fewer people have to vote on proposed modifications.

Mr. Martin: Jack, you answered Jeff Orleans' question with an answer that I think is contradictory to what was just read in the report of the subcommittee, in that you answered Jeff's question, as I understand it, to say that, yes, Division I-A could pass a grant on aid that would be room, board, books, tuition fees and \$400 a month and impose upon Division I-AA a restriction of \$3.22. That seems to be contradictory to what was just read in the report from the committee. I would like that point cleared up for the record, because I think it's important that if, in fact, one of those statements is in conflict, the one that is incorrect should be erased from the record:

Charlotte West (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): In response to your questions, I think there are two specific issues: who votes and what you're voting on. I have been concerned about this issue and asked the question of the Council and got this interpretation. Within a division, within Division I, if it is a football issue only, the vote would be by I-A and I-AA collectively. I-AAA would not vote if it were a football issue. Now, the other question you asked is what we're voting on; and if in fact the motion proposed differential aid for I-A and I-AA, that would be the motion. Whether it passed or not would be determined by the majority of people voting, and that voting body would be a combination of I-A and I-AA.

Olav B. Kollevoll (Lafayette College): I've heard this interpretation that if it was a football issue, Divisions I-A and I-AA would vote in concert. I've heard it two or three times. I have yet to see it, and I don't know where it says it. And I would assume if this is so, something written as inferred from the Council, or whatever, would have to come out. But people are telling me that. I can read all the material I have, and I can't find it.

Ms. Norrell-Thomas: As Charlotte said, she asked this question last night; and it was an interpretation of the parliamentarian.

Robert A. Bowlsby (University of Northern Iowa): We've talked about this as an issue that deals primarily with I-A football versus I-AA football, but I'd like to address to somebody the question of Division I voting alone on a simple-majority issue. It would seem conceivable that somewhere down the road Division I acting alone and needing only a simple majority to enact legislation could vote to have higher financial aid restrictions not only in football in I-A and I-AA, but also in basketball, separate from the rest of the sports.

If, in fact, that is the case, all of a sudden we have another 135 or 140 votes from those I-AAA people who say, "All right, let's enact a \$100-a-month stipend for football," Division I-AA votes, and we lose. Most of us can't afford to do that, so we just stay where we're at. There aren't a great many in Division I who have basketball as their No. 1 priority. If we were to have something that involved a stipend for basketball players, it becomes fairly obvious that I-AA is going to get squeezed in it. We're all still trying to operate fairly expensive football programs, and it has primarily been a I-AA, I-A football issue to this point.

But it certainly seems to have some ramifications for our other sports as well, particularly basketball. Is that scenario possible?

Mr. Doland: There is a lot of scenarios that are possible. That is possible. You can think whichever way you wish on that, because it's all possible.

Eddie Milton Jones (Grambling State University): As I listened to the six-paragraph explanation, I heard phrases or terms such as "determine independently" and "division independence." Whatever the semantics that might be used in this case, I believe that it ultimately boils down to the point that Division I-A would then be more marketable, more appealing to athletes, and that we are sealing our own doom if we go along with this kind of chicanery. I think that we need to think not only of the present, but for the far-reaching implications, because ultimately we are going to be moved out of the market as we were when we had the television program switched over. So we can take it in terms of this being something that will not affect us right now, but it is going to affect us ultimately.

Mr. Fort: Let me make a comment on that, because I support what the gentleman just said. This is not a Presidents Commission position, by the way. It's mine, speaking from my university. I might add, by the way, that the Commission has not taken a position on this, because there is cleavage. Two of the divisions within the Presidents Commission are on one side of the coin with regard to this issue, the other one is on the other side. But in support of what the speaker just said, I view this issue thus: That, in effect, what you're talking about literally, ultimately, is a stipend to certain athletes on a division-specific basis according to the financial resources within those institutions. A student literally can get — as I interpret the proposal — his full scholarship plus the financial aid package; and you know as well as I that not every campus, even with Division I-AA, can handle that type of chicanery. And so for that reason, it's unfair; and that's the reason why I'm going to vote against it.

[Note: In a straw vote, the delegate defeated Proposal No. 44 76-6.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Maximum Awards — Division I-AA Football

Stanley G. Rives (Eastern Illinois University): I move to refer Proposal No. 96 to the Presidents Commission.

[The motion was seconded.]

My institution is one of several that sponsored this legislation. I am very much in favor of this legislation; but I think it makes sense for us to deal with the issue in the total context of the June meeting, and that's why I'm recommending that it be referred until that time.

[Proposal No. 96 (Page A-71) was referred to the Presidents Commission by Division I-AA. A later motion to reconsider was defeated by Division I-AA.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Presidents Commission Grouping

John L. Toner (University of Connecticut): I hate to hold this up; but I'm confused, and I want to speak just one more time on No. 44. Jim Delany clarified for me by referral to the bylaw which indicates that in matters of financial aid, Division I would vote collectively regarding Division I limitations. This body here, I think, voted on the impression that I-A was going to

control all votes. I think the legislation is too good and too worthy to leave here with a misconception; and if I'm wrong, I want to be told so.

It appears to me that if we submit any — from any part of Division I — legislation regarding financial aid limitations, Division I-A, Division I-AA and Division I-AAA will all vote; and there is a very decided majority in Division I-AA and I-AAA over that of I-A. I think some people here are running scared that I-A is going to control financial aid limitations, and they can't. That's my impression. Now, am I right, or am I wrong? And if I am right, there might be some benefit in reconsidering the straw vote.

Eddie Milton Jones (Grambling State University): What are we talking about, apples or oranges? The tuition at some schools is considerably higher than at other schools, and it is more conceivable that a student could pocket enough money to more than cover the tuition at other schools. And if this does not make those other schools more marketable, then there is something wrong with our thinking. This is exactly what is going to happen regardless of what the other rationales are. Some schools are going to be more attractive than other schools because of what the students will end up being able to pocket.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group Presidents): I'd really like to just second what John Toner has said. I think it's terribly important that we know tomorrow how financial aid votes would be made within Division I. It seems to me, as John has said, that if we would be voting on financial aid, football accepted as an entire division, and if we assume that it would be very hard, practically for anyone, to try and treat football grants more favorably than basketball grants, then on those two premises, adoption of No. 44 would give us the chance at the special Convention in June to act on financial aid proposals with only a majority of all Division I to substantially curtail the costs of grants-in-aid, which I think is something that we and our colleagues in I-AAA would really welcome.

On the other hand, if in fact, football can be easily separated out and voted on only by I-A, then we do stand the substantial risk that was just identified. So it's terribly important for us to know from all the bylaws and all the constitutional provisions how financial aid would be voted on by Division I under Proposal No. 44. And it's terribly important for the Council to know that we can't vote on a proposal that the Council appears really to want if the Council can't tell us what its procedural consequences are.

It's not a matter of people unwilling to hear the Council. It's a matter of seeing the Council, and maybe the I-A people on the Council, after all their five years of asking this, still can't tell us what it means in voting terms.

Mr. Doland: The next ones that we go to will be the coaches' compensation, Nos. 50, 51, 52 and 53. These also have been covered in the earlier discussion. We move on to No. 54 and that having to do with eligibility.

Mr. Fort: Jack, let me make just a quick comment on that one again. Aside from what my colleague, Jeff Orleans, said about this one earlier, I think he and I are in agreement on this. The position that the Presidents Commission took on this yesterday after the lengthy discussion was, again, this: that an attempt would be made on the floor to seek a referral of this question to the Presidents Commission for further study — and here's the caution — with no predetermination as to what the nature of the results of that study would be. There is, I might add, within the Commission some cleavage here. There is one body within that group that feels strongly that

this should not be debated and that the Presidents Commission should not seek to develop legislation designed to say no more freshman eligibility. On the other hand, there are colleagues within that same Commission who have the opposing point of view. Our position is no predetermination with regard to what would be the nature of the deliberations or the outcome of same as far as deferral to that body is concerned.

The point is, the attempt will be made to have this deferred to the Commission. Additionally, if that does occur, if it gets support from the body and the floor, there is no guarantee that this would be a part of the June Convention. It might very well not occur at all, as far as I'm concerned, until January of 1988.

Eddie Milton Jones (Grambling State University): Let me ask what may appear to be an asinine question. If this proposal is passed for freshman eligibility, how does this, or how could this, or how might this affect 5-1-(j) in terms of nonpredictors? Does someone wish to answer that? Would it moot it?

Mr. Doland: It would moot 5-1-(j).

Academics

The next section of this report would be Nos. 62, 63. The particular interest is on No. 62, on academic reporting, and No. 63, which is a position on nonqualifiers. No. 67 then. The Council has supported this, and you can read the intent. I think the information about using the two test scores would be of value right now. If a student takes the SAT twice, he can use the high scores from each for initial eligibility for this year only. If the student takes the ACT test twice, three times or four, he can use the highest composite of the four parts of the ACT for initial eligibility this year. That will be corrected or allowed to stand after this year on its own merit. The feeling was that we shouldn't do this; but we had already announced that you could do it in the SAT; so we're going to allow it for this year. That has been the staff interpretation for this year, to be changed possibly next year.

Recruiting

Mr. Doland: We'll move on to Nos. 81 and 82, these may possibly be withdrawn.

Financial Aid

Mr. Doland: Nos. 94 and 95 on this agenda, and these are on the maximum awards. I feel that these too, will be withdrawn and referred to the summer Convention. I believe the Presidents Commission has recommended withdrawing 94 and 95, and the PAC-10 is recommending withdrawing.

Eligibility

Gene Bleymaier (Boise State University): On behalf of the Big Sky Conference, I'd like to discuss Proposal No. 145, which we feel is very significant and has some far-reaching beneficial ramifications for the body. The first comment I'd like to make is to explain to the group that this will be voted upon this afternoon in the Division I business session. The voting line, as published in your booklet, was erroneous. This year we wanted this to be a Division I-only vote. Because of the error, the Council has decided that it will be voted upon in Division I this afternoon. It will also be brought up on Friday to Divisions II and III to give them the opportunity to vote on it also.

Briefly, this proposal has three main benefits that I'd like to discuss. One, it will increase graduation rates among student athletes. Two, this is a financial issue that will save institutions money without cutting programs and without cutting scholarships. And three, this is a proposal that would go a long way toward solving the dilemma that we find ourselves in regarding freshman eligibility.

First of all, how will this increase graduation rates? Most students now are on a five-year academic plan. Last year at this Convention, we dealt with entrance requirements. We now need to deal with the point when eligibility is exhausted at the soft end, where attrition is the greatest. In an NCAA study published in 1981, conducted by the American College Testing program, it was found that only 41.5 percent of all male students had graduated after five years — not after four years, but after five years. Only 41 percent of all male students — not student-athletes; all male students — had graduated.

This is also, number two, a financial issue. This is a cost-saving measure. It will save institutions enormous amounts of money in two ways. First of all, you will be able to save 20 percent of your recruiting budgets; because you will not be recruiting as many student-athletes — 20 percent of your recruiting budget. Secondly, the fifth year can be funded now at no additional cost. Currently, if you have a student-athlete who uses up his eligibility and wants to finish school that fifth year, you have to pay for that over and above your scholarship limitations. So if you have 15 in basketball, you pay for those 15, plus you may have another three or four fifth-year seniors who have used up their eligibility. So now you're paying for 19 or 20 scholarships. Under this proposal, you would never have to pay for more than 15, because those 15 scholarships would be good for five years instead of four. Many schools — and I think this is especially applicable to Division I-AA, in our situation — cannot even afford to pay for the fifth year. So once our student-athletes exhaust their eligibility after 3½ to four years, we send them on their way. We do not pay for that fifth year, even though they need that fifth year in order to graduate. So we use up their eligibility, we exploit them, so to speak; and then when the fifth year comes that they need to graduate, we tell them, "Hey, we can't afford it, and you'll have to get financial aid on your own." Many of those student-athletes are from out of state, and it is impossible for them to pay the out-of-state fees.

Third, this proposal could be the answer to freshmen being eligible. We have heard that many presidents want freshmen to be ineligible; but we also hear from the coaches that they say, "Hey, you cannot take 25 percent of my team and expect me to compete. If you want freshmen to be ineligible, fine, but I will need more scholarships." That's what the coaches say. Well, more scholarships means more money; and none of us is in a position to add scholarships at this point. So when this survey was conducted a year ago at the Division I level, 79 percent of the schools voted against freshmen being ineligible.

How does the five-year rule solve this? First, if you had five years of eligibility, the coaches would have the fifth-year seniors available for participation. So, they have enough people to play with. The second thing is because they have those fifth-year seniors, very few, if any, freshmen would be able to break into the starting lineups. So the presidents would get what they want substantially, and that is for freshmen to be relieved of the pressures

of playing intercollegiate athletics. This would happen under this rule, because very few freshmen would be talented enough to play as a freshman. But the coaches would have what they want, which is enough players to compete, because they have that fifth-year class.

So I think this is a very important point that I have not heard made anywhere this year. This could be the answer to the compromise on the freshman-eligibility question. This rule also would eliminate redshirting completely. It would eliminate also the hardship rule, which can be easily misused and abused. We would now be providing a better opportunity for student-athletes than we are currently to complete their education by assuring them five years.

Our satisfactory-progress rule and our eligibility rules that we have right now are geared to five years. We require a student-athlete to complete 12 hours a term, 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours a year. If you do that, it will take you five years to graduate, not four. Our academic-reporting requirement that was begun this year asks us to report how many students graduate after five years, not after four. So why don't we allow students to compete for five years? We've already acknowledged that very few students complete their education and graduate in four years.

Now, some critics say that this would be looked upon as exploiting the student-athletes. We can't do this because the press is going to misunderstand it, and we're going to be using the student-athletes now and making matters worse. I say to you, the real exploitation in intercollegiate athletics is occurring right now with the rules that we have. We use student-athletes for four years. We use them, and then we let them go well before they are ready to graduate because they are on a five-year academic plan. We use them up, and then we won't pay for that fifth year. We redshirt student athletes for our benefit, not for the student-athlete's benefit. It's for our benefit, depriving them of the opportunity to compete for an entire year. Some student-athletes who are redshirting end up losing an entire year of eligibility because they have to play late in the season because the two guys ahead of them got hurt. They haven't competed in the first seven or eight games; but now, because of injuries, the coach has to enlist them to play. They may play one or two or three games; and yet they've used up an entire year, one out of four years of their eligibility.

In summary, here we have a proposal that will increase graduation rates, it will save schools money without cutting scholarships and without eliminating sports. I don't know how else you can save money and not affect those two areas. It basically would solve the freshman-eligibility issue, which, as we see today, is becoming a bigger and bigger issue. And fortunately, this proposal would put an end to the many inequities that are now occurring in intercollegiate athletics.

Francis W. Bonner (Furman University): I rose to speak to this last year. I've been coming to these Conventions for 20 years, I believe. This is, without a doubt, the worst piece of legislation I've seen proposed. I do not accept and I won't attempt to reply to all of the statistics and so on which we've heard. I simply do not accept them. At my institution, we do everything we can to enable and encourage the student-athlete to graduate in four years. That's what we're all about, education. And I feel that there are many institutions in this organization that follow this same procedure.

What we're going to do if this legislation passes is become more athletics

institutions rather than academic institutions. We graduate 80 percent of our athletes in four years. Now, I hope that our coach is not put in a position where, in order to compete with another institution, he's going to hold back those players and keep them for five years. This would be sending the wrong signal if we adopted this legislation. It would be moving us in the wrong direction. In all of our talk about a new emphasis on academics, I think it would be just so much hot air.

Eddie Milton Jones (Grambling State University): If I'm not mistaken, if the students are given the fifth year, then one who is judiciously concerned about the area of academics could pursue a graduate degree, as I believe is outlined now. A student can do this if he's not used up his eligibility. So any of you — any of the other universities — if the students are concerned about degrees, then this would be a further point to help the student-athlete to get a graduate degree.

Marino H. Casem (Southern University, Baton Rouge): Does Proposal No. 145 carry with it — after we extend the eligibility for five years — a hardship exception?

Mr. Doland: No. This would be five years with no hardship or redshirting.

Jimmy Feix (Western Kentucky University): I rise in strong support of what I think is the most practical, most visionary, most academically sound piece of legislature that has been before this body in the many years that I have been in our Association. We, too, at Western Kentucky University attempt to graduate all our students in their curriculum programs in four years but are unable to do that. Research statistics support that a small majority, a minority, indeed, of students graduate in four years. As academic knowledge increases and multiplies, it is going to become more difficult to graduate, plus the pressures of times on students and athletes. We have addressed the entrance requirements. We have a satisfactory progress rule to ensure satisfactory progress. I think this piece of legislation addresses the exit requirements in this system on those issues.

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): I won't say it's either the best or worst, but I have some serious reservations about the legislation. The way it's couched is completely in terms of the length of time the student-athlete would have to compete. If we're indeed worried about the academic support of these athletes, it would seem to me we ought to be a little more direct about addressing that and stating that. This resolution doesn't really do that. And it seems to me one effect of this would be to have many coaches assume they have a player for a fifth year, and that player jolly well may not graduate after five years any more than they do after four. The thing we have to address is how to get many of our coaches to be as supportive as they can be of the academic side of what these people are doing. This does not address it, and I think it may just have the effect of having people around for one more year and still not graduating.

Mr. Bleymaier: Our academic requirements now are such that you have to complete 24 semester hours towards a degree every year in order to remain eligible. So by definition, you have to be within one year of graduation after four years. You would have been correct in the past when we

didn't have these — the eligibility requirements that we now have — but by definition, you have to be close to graduating after four years of eligibility.

[In a straw vote, Division I-AA defeated Proposal No. 145 (38-34).]

[The Division I-AA business session was adjourned at approximately 10:30 a.m.]

DIVISION I-AAA BUSINESS SESSION

Thursday Morning, January 8, 1987

The Division I-AAA business session was convened at 8 a.m. by Don J. DiJulia, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference, chair.

[Note: Because no votes were taken in the session, the following is a summary of the discussion. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning the proposed amendments is summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Presidents Commission

Walter B. Waetjen, Cleveland State University, and Lattie F. Coor, University of Vermont, reported to the delegates on actions taken by the Presidents Commission in appointing an ad hoc committee to study institutional responsibility. They noted that the Commission had had two primary goals since its inception: to ensure that all athletics programs are conducted with integrity and to ensure that a proper balance is maintained between athletics and other institutional programs. As a result of meetings in November and December 1986, the ad hoc committee identified five principles that should apply to intercollegiate athletics. Specifically, the five were identified as recruitment of student-athletes, compensation for coaches, playing and practice seasons, the size of coaching staffs, and financial aid. It was reported that the Commission had called a special Convention for June, at which time legislation related to these five principles would be considered. In the meantime, the Commission would ask sponsors of legislation having to do with the five areas to withdraw the proposals from consideration at this Convention so that carefully considered and packaged legislation could be proposed for the special Convention. Each of the five areas and a Commission resolution were reviewed in detail.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Presidents Commission Grouping

Chair DiJulia explained to the delegates that Proposal No. 44 would move sections regarding financial aid from the constitution to the bylaws and that no changes in the limits on financial aid were being considered at this Convention. Proposals at subsequent Conventions would be considered by each division independently. A straw vote indicated that the delegates were split in their support or opposition to No. 44. Other straw votes indicated that the delegates were split evenly on No. 49, which would reduce the evaluation and recruiting seasons in basketball: opposed to No. 54, a resolution that called for specific legislation to eliminate freshman eligibility, and opposed to No. 47, which would remove boosters from the recruiting process. There was some feeling expressed by the delegates that the four proposals having to do with outside compensation of coaches were areas better left to the member institutions.

Membership and Classification

Proposal No. 108, which would increase the number of teams sports required for Division I membership from two to three for both men and women, was discussed; and the opinion was expressed that it would involve

an increase in institutional budgets at a time when cost containment appears to be a trend in intercollegiate athletics. A straw vote indicated that the delegates were opposed to the proposal. There also was discussion on No. 111, which would place an institution on probation for one year rather than in an unclassified membership status for failing to meet the sports sponsorship criteria. A straw vote indicated support for the proposal. The delegates also indicated in a straw vote that they would oppose No. 105, which would eliminate multidivision classification for all Division III institutions and prohibit Division I or Division II institutions from classifying a sport in Division III.

Playing and Practice Seasons

The delegates discussed Proposal No. 123 and the amendments to it that had been proposed. It was the general consensus that the delegates would support the amendment to exempt the home contest against foreign teams or an ABA/USA club team but would oppose No. 123 without the amendment.

DIVISION II BUSINESS SESSION

Thursday Morning, January 8, 1987

The meeting was called to order at 8 a.m. by Asa N. Green, Livingston University, chair.

Mr. Green: Good morning, and welcome to the 1987 business session of Division II. We have a fairly long agenda, and we will try to move it as expeditiously as possible throughout the day while still providing full opportunity for questions and debates. Contrary to our procedure last year when we went through the agenda with members of the Steering Committee endeavoring to explain the items of legislation, and then returned to vote on those that required action, we think it will save time if after we complete the explanation, questions and discussions, we vote immediately. It is important to note that on Proposal Nos. 64, 65 and 66, we will have a roll-call vote, as mandated by the Presidents Commission. At this time, I would call upon President James Cleary of California State University, Northridge, who is serving two roles for us today. Jim is going to serve as parliamentarian for the debate. Additionally, at this point, he will give a report from the Presidents Commission, which met yesterday.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENTS COMMISSION

James Cleary (California State University, Northridge): Those of you who perhaps read the account in this morning's newspaper relating to a press conference that was held yesterday by Chancellor John Slaughter, chair of the Presidents Commission accompanied by Chancellor I.M. Heyman, chair of the Division I Committee and chair of the ad hoc committee on institutional responsibilities, already know that a special Convention for June has been called by the Presidents Commission to address a number of critical issues.

I would like to give you some background as to how we got from a meeting late last fall between an ad hoc committee from ACE, chaired by Chancellor Charles Young of University of California, Los Angeles, and the Presidents Commission to where we are today responding to some of the discussions that occurred last fall. After that initial discussion with some concern of the presidents and chancellors, the Presidents Commission, or more accurately, Chancellor John Slaughter, who is chair of the Commission, appointed an ad hoc committee consisting of Division I members, chaired by, as I indicated, Chancellor Heyman. So that there would be some communication with Divisions II and III, Chancellor Slaughter appointed President Jim Whalen, chair of the Division III subcommittee, as an observer for that division, and myself as an observer for Division II.

The focus was on concept in the two or three meetings that occurred between then and now—a focus on balance between the intercollegiate athletics program and academic programs within an institution. And if you look at that buff-colored handout, you see that there are several resolutions dealing with recruiting of students, compensation of coaches, playing and practice sessions, size of coaching staff, and financial aid.

In yesterday's Presidents Commission meeting, the Commission, with the full support of all division subcommittees, including the Division II subcommittee, approved the principles that are articulated in the

"whereas" clauses of those resolutions. Secondly, it approved the convening of the special Convention June 29-30, to be held in Dallas, Texas. In addition, the full Commission, with the support of the division subcommittees, approved the recommended withdrawals and the approval of certain resolutions that relate to the task or the objective of cost containment and balance. If you will read the handout carefully, you will see those resolutions are numbered. About 14 or 15 proposals have been recommended to be withdrawn at this Convention; and some others are being put forward or recommended as resolutions on which we ought to act today, because they are in consonance with the objective of that ad hoc committee report and the resolution to that report by the Commission.

At the special Convention, in all probability, and I cannot say for sure but judging from the discussions yesterday, there will be a policy proposal that will first identify the principles on which specific recommendations will be based. The general pattern will be to move from the general to the specific; and those principles, as I indicated earlier, are identified, articulated in the whereas clauses of each of those resolutions. The ad hoc committee will be meeting shortly to refine or review these resolutions. And after, I presume, appropriate consultation and requests for additional input, it will arrive at other principles that should be articulated along perhaps with specific courses of action.

The interests of Divisions II and III have been addressed yesterday afternoon at the Presidents Commission, and it's my understanding that that ad hoc committee will continue and that President Whalen and myself will continue to operate with that committee as observers. There will be an objective or an intent to arrive at recommendations regarding legislation well enough before April 1, which is the time of the next meeting of the Presidents Commission, to permit the chairs, President Whalen and myself, to convene the divisional committees of the Commission. There will be an opportunity for us to then respond or propose modifications, or whatever so that everything comes together at the April 1 meeting of the Presidents Commission. The establishing of the agenda will rest with the responsibility of the Executive Committee of the Presidents Commission, which consists of the chair of the Commission, Chancellor Slaughter, and the divisional committee chairs, Chancellor Heyman, President Whalen and myself.

I don't want to go any further than this, to assure you that the general objectives of the Presidents Commission has been articulated and acted upon. What remains ahead is refinement of what you have in your hand with an eye to addressing the interests of all institutions and concerns that have been expressed with regard to institutional responsibility and balance between athletics programs on the one hand and academic programs completing the circuit on the other, sharing whatever resources are available for all of the things that make a university move.

The only other thing I have to report is the action taken on certain proposals in your agenda. On Proposal No. 44, which has to do with moving financial aid from the constitution to the bylaws, making it a divisional issue for providing the separate divisions jurisdiction, the Commission took no position and will put it up to a vote at the general meeting on Friday. And institutions have to vote. Historically, traditionally, this issue came up within the Presidents Commission; Division II opposed No. 44, and that

position has not changed. That's why the Commission did not take a formal position on No. 44, leaving it to the voting delegates at this Convention.

The Commission took a position of support on Proposal Nos. 55, 56, 57 and 58, having to do with enforcement procedures, upon hearing a special report, which was a very fine report provided by the chair of the Infractions Committee, specially, Frank Remington from the University of Wisconsin, and four members of that committee. The Commission accepted the recommendation of that committee to approve their procedures they would like to have and put these four proposals into place. The Commission responded favorably to that request and recommendation.

There is a last item that has to do with Nos. 64, 65, and 66. The Presidents Commission took the formal position of strong support for No. 64. Not only the Division II subcommittee, but the full Commission recommendation coming out of the Division II subcommittee was to support No. 64. That was prior to the advent of Proposal Nos. 65 and 66. But the formal position of the Presidents Commission is in strong support of 64.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Consent Package—Constitution, Special Rules

Mr. Green: We will begin our review of legislation with the consent package and Louise Albrecht will review for us the proposed constitutional changes and special rules in the consent package.

Ms. Louise Albrecht (Southern Connecticut State University): The consent package for constitutional changes is essentially previous legislation that has been passed and now has been placed in the Manual. No. 1 is the Annual Independent Financial Audit, and it simply clarifies the deadline date for completing the financial audit. No. 2, the Eligibility Appeals, simply states that if you have a separate administrative structure for both men and women's athletics programs, that either of the directors may process an eligibility appeal. No. 3, the Executive Committee, simply permits appointments to the Executive Committee with less than full terms, so as to adjust the membership of that committee.

No. 4 the Executive Director, simply clarifies that the executive director is administratively responsible to the Executive Committee and is authorized to employ staff personnel. No. 5, which has several clarifications, simply removes the Administrative Committee from Constitution 6-2 and places the Legislation and Interpretations Committee in it. And to help you clarify and read the bylaw, it states that at least three members of the committee shall be members of the Council, which means that there will be one member from each division. It's just a manner in which to handle business more efficiently within the division with the federated concept. And No. 6 just gives an additional week for the deadline for notification of proposed amendments.

Consent Package—Bylaw, Others

Mr. Rudy Carvajal (California State University, Bakersfield): As indicated in the program, the consent package is considered to be noncontroversial. There are two basic parts of the consent package. The first part addresses several issues that have been advanced from the Extra Events Committee, the Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification, the Classification Committee, and the Division II Steering Committee.

The second part—Proposal Nos. 18 through 41—deal with the various committees of the Association. Several involve the creation of new committees, mostly structural changes, proposals to assist in the streamlining of the work of the Association and to deal more effectively with current issues of the Association. There will be some difficulties in size. I think these can be handled, when committees are combined, through attrition; and those that are terminated can serve as consultants while completing their current projects. As we review the proposals, you can read the intents listed; and I will attempt briefly to summarize or clarify. If you have a question you can stop me.

Starting with Proposal No. 7—basically, we increased the insurance requirement from \$10,000 to \$25,000. Proposal No. 8 provides the latitude to avoid scheduling of certified games on only two weekends and deals only with the seniors who have concluded their eligibility. Proposal No. 9 requires insurance for gymnastics and track and field from \$10,000 and \$25,000, respectively. Proposal No. 10, prohibits the certification of track meets that conflict with the Division I women's and men's championships. Basically, this protects the integrity of the championships and provides the same treatment for the women's track and field championships that is enjoyed currently by the men's program.

Proposal No. 11 shifts the responsibility of eligibility certification from the Eligibility Committee to the Academic Requirements Committee. Proposal No. 12 gives the Academic Requirements Committee the responsibility to review the section to the minimum academic load requirements. Proposal No. 13 specifies the time period of eligibility where students are competing in their last term or quarter of eligibility. Proposal No. 14, shifts the eligibility certification to the Academic Requirements Committee for early admissions exceptions from the Eligibility Committee. Proposal No. 15 cleans up the language regarding the sports sponsorship requirement.

Proposal No. 16 clarifies the effective dates of classification criteria for each division. Proposal No. 17 comes from our steering committee and provides the same opportunity for women's team sports and accounting procedures for Division II criteria that currently are enjoyed by our men's team sports.

Proposal Nos. 18 through 41, again, are dealing with the establishment and expansion of the committees. Proposal No. 18 requires each NCAA Council-appointed committee other than those listed to have a Council member on each. Proposal No. 19 expands the Academic Requirements Committee, picking up the new loads that were assigned to the Eligibility Committee. Proposal No. 20 abolishes the Classification Committee. The responsibilities will be picked up by NCAA staff personnel. Proposal No. 21 establishes the Communications Committee to incorporate the current functions of the Public Relations and Football Television Committees. Proposal No. 22 abolishes the Community and Junior College Relations Committee.

Proposal No. 23 expands from 12 to 15 members the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports. And that committee will pick up the additional responsibilities of the drug-education and testing program.

Proposal No. 24 expands the Eligibility Committee and provides that eligibility will be dealt with on a federated basis. This is the one I think needs

a little bit of clarification. It means basically that we now will be dividing the Eligibility Committee into divisions so that where we have issues regarding a specific division, those will be dealt with by your own divisions. So it's really a peer-group approach to dealing with eligibility questions. Now, the full eligibility group will still continue to meet as a forum to make sure that the guidelines are somewhat consistent and that the application of penalties will be in a consistent fashion.

Proposal No. 25 establishes a Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism. Proposal No. 26 establishes the Honors Committee, incorporating the Theodore Roosevelt Award Committee and the Top XII Selection Committee.

Proposal No. 27 abolishes the Insurance Committee. Its responsibilities will be picked up by NCAA staff, and those members who currently are serving will be allowed to act as consultants and continue their projects until concluded. Proposal No. 28 expands from eight to 12 members the Professional Sports Liaison Committee and picks up the additional responsibilities of the Ice Hockey Developmental Funding and the Summer Baseball Committees.

Proposal No. 29 establishes a Committee on Review and Planning, which will incorporate the responsibilities of the Long Range Planning Committee. Proposal No. 30 establishes the Special Events Committee to handle many of the functions of the current Extra Events, High School All-Star Games and Postseason Football Committees. This goes back, I believe, to 1980 when these functions were handled by one group.

Proposal No. 31 abolishes the Football Television Committee. Proposal No. 32 abolishes the Volunteers for Youth Committee. Proposal No. 33 establishes a Committee on Women's Athletics as a standing committee of the Association. Proposal No. 34 changes the Divisions I, II and III Championships Committee from special committees to a standing committee and gives the Executive Committee the responsibility to appoint the members.

Proposal No. 35 provides that the secretary-rules editor of the Men's and Women's Rifle Committee may be selected without restriction and increases the committee from six to seven members. Proposal No. 36 changes the representation on the Men's Gymnastics Committee by requiring that four of six members must be from Division I. Proposal No. 37 combines the Men's and Women's Swimming Committees. Proposal No. 38 provides that the sports committees may establish championship selection criteria that includes requirements for the utilization of regular-season playing rules to be used in NCAA championships.

Proposal No. 39 has been withdrawn or will be withdrawn. Proposal No. 40, combines the Men's and Women's Golf Committees. Proposal No. 41 combines the Men's and Women's Tennis Committees. Proposal No. 42 will be withdrawn. Proposal No. 43 encourages the institutions to annually review the insurance coverage.

Presidents Commission Grouping

Mr. Green: It falls on my lot to handle the next three items. I might point out that beginning with Proposal No. 44, the next 18 proposals on the agenda were placed in this order by the Presidents Commission. This was done because these were felt to be matters on which presidents had a particular interest and to enable presidents to come to the Convention and to participate in the debate and voting on those issues without having to remain

throughout the entire Convention.

I want to explain Proposal No. 44 rather carefully. It is endorsed and offered by the NCAA Council via a special subcommittee of which I was a member to review financial aid issues. You will recall that in past years there have been, at almost every Convention, proposals put forward by members of Division I to increase the financial aid allowed under the NCAA constitution. At the present time, financial aid is under the constitution, which states essentially that a grant-in-aid to a student-athlete may not exceed tuition and required fees, room and board, and course-related books. Through the years, there has been one exception allowed, and that is a constitutional provision that allows exceptions of that portion of a Pell Grant award up to \$900.

During the years, I have been one of those who lead the debate against many of those proposals to increase financial aid, because I felt that given the tight economic circumstances of Division II, we simply could not afford it. It always bothered me, though, that because it is a constitutional provision, it must be voted upon by all divisions and approved by a two-thirds vote. In defending the position of Division II, I was at the same time opposing Division I representatives who felt the increases were in their best interests. I think a number of Divisions II and III delegates who opposed those measures felt uncomfortable doing it. It also has become a somewhat contentious issue, particularly between Divisions I and II. It was for that reason that I agreed to serve as a member of the special subcommittee that looked at this problem.

Now, you will recall that a year ago there was a proposal on your agenda to take financial aid from the constitution and move it into the bylaws so that each division could act autonomously. That was sponsored by the Council, and it was withdrawn at the request of the Presidents Commission. We felt that it did not contain adequate safeguards and caps. I think it's fair to say that no one really has proposed that any division have the right to give financial aid without restraint.

Essentially, Proposal No. 44 does two things. What it does not do is to make any changes in the current level of financial aid for any division. The special committee and the Council felt very strongly that we wanted a clean vote on the issue of moving the financial aid limit from the constitution to the bylaws so that each division could act autonomously without being cluttered up with a proposal at the same time to increase or make other changes in those aids. So there is no change in the financial aid.

Proposal 44, in effect, would allow any division at the 1988 Convention, a year from now, to make changes in the financial aid limits for that division subject to two criteria. Any aid above the present level allowed by the constitution would have to be based upon demonstrated financial need. Secondly, under no circumstances could such additional aid exceed the cost of attendance incurred by students enrolled in comparable programs. The committee expended a good deal of time talking with representatives of the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, and we got very good input from them.

They felt these caps were appropriate and sufficiently widespread and established in usage largely through the criteria mandated by the Department of Education and that there was a rather clear understanding of how you calculate demonstrated financial need and of what constitutes cost of

attendance. Obviously, you could ask a lot of detailed questions about this; and it is going to be incumbent upon the sponsors of legislation in the future to respond to those questions. But as a constitutional cap, a restraint upon the action by any division, if granted autonomy to do so, these seem to us clear and adequate.

Again, it makes no change in the present level of allowable financial aid. It is a very simple proposal. In fact, I about reached the conclusion that it may be too simple, because people have gone around for three days now looking for the hidden agenda or the hidden meaning. I assure you as a member of the committee that there is no hidden meaning. This is a very straightforward proposal, which is intended to allow our divisions, subject to adequate safeguards, to act independently on establishing their financial aid limits.

I, as the vice president for Division II, as a member of the subcommittee that worked on this proposal and personally as president of Livingston University hope that it will be passed at this Convention, keeping in mind that the Division II members of the Presidents Commission will go on record as opposing it.

James W. Cleary (California State University, Northridge): In regard to that posture taken by the Division II subcommittee of the Presidents Commission, I might say that the subcommittee did not base its position on suspicion that there is a hidden agenda.

It seemed logical to the Division II subcommittee to have that resolution or proposal withdrawn in light of the ad hoc committee's resolution that would call for Proposal Nos. 45, 93, 94, 95, and 96, all having to do with financial aid, be deferred until the special Convention when the whole notion of financial aid would be addressed. It did not make sense to the subcommittee to separate No. 45 and take action on that and then postpone the others.

Mr. Green: I might say that in reference to No. 45, we were advised at the Council meeting last evening that the sponsors of No. 45, which is a proposal sponsored by the Big Ten Conference that would increase the extension, will be withdrawn at the general business session. They did this in response to a request from the Council so that we could have a very clean vote on Proposal No. 44, which as I said, is simply a proposal to allow each division to act autonomously on matters relating to financial aid for student-athletes within that division.

Proposal No. 46 relates to satisfactory progress. Basically, it does two things. It moves the date for certification of eligibility to the fall term of each academic year. It was felt that in the long run it is simpler and more direct to relate satisfactory progress to what is the generally accepted academic year rather than to do it for seasons of competition or otherwise. This will, incidentally, simplify, we think, the certification process in many respects. It also eliminates the option of banking hours, which was perceived increasingly as a major loophole in the present satisfactory-progress program, particularly, if you view the satisfactory-progress rule as leading ultimately towards the goal of graduation. We found instances where students had banked hours. When they had to declare a major, they really had not made substantial progress in fulfilling their graduation requirements.

It does retain the present provision that a student who is ineligible at the beginning of the fall quarter can become eligible at the beginning of a sub-

sequent term. What you would do is go back a year, counting that fall term, so that the progress would be based on a year of work. A student who was ineligible in the fall could become eligible at the beginning of the following quarter.

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): I can speak only for one institution. I don't know if there are others, but we now have a fairly active coop program where youngsters walk into the marketplace and are placed in a job with industry. The program is designed to include a semester and summer. It's more than just a three-month situation. This would lead me to believe, then, that if we had an athlete, soccer player or football player, who competed in the fall and when the program in the spring proceeded through the summer, that student coming back to the institution in the fall really would have no opportunity to satisfy the 24-hour rule. We may be unique, but it seems to me if I read this correctly, it will be a real burden.

Mr. Green: That will not change with this legislation. If he has a problem now, he probably will have a problem under the proposed legislation; but it's not going to change anything in that respect.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): I assume that this would mean that a student in his first year of attendance—take a junior college transfer—passes 24 units with a 2.400 grade-point average and is declared eligible as a spring-sport athlete. He's declared eligible at the beginning of the fall term on the basis of 24 units, 2.400, etc. He then, apparently, becomes eligible in the spring term again regardless of what he does in that fall term. If there is a one-time declaration of eligibility, he can enroll in 12 units in the fall, pass five units with a "D" average and still compete in the spring. In the meantime, he's passed 29 units in three semesters and barely has a 2.0, and he's automatically eligible in the spring.

Mr. Green: Right.

Mr. Barkey: That's absurd, don't you think?

Mr. Green: No, because you will catch him the following year.

Mr. Barkey: In the meantime, you have given him a free year of eligibility with 29 units in three terms and you win a championship with him.

Mr. Green: He was eligible when he came in the fall?

Mr. Barkey: Yes, he initially came in the fall out of junior college; competed in a spring sport; passed 24 units for that particular year, and at the beginning of his succeeding fall term, he is declared eligible based on his previous year's academic work. He now takes 12 units and knows he is eligible in the spring; he doesn't even care about going to classes. He's a junior college transfer; he can get his second year of eligibility and doesn't even have to go to classes in the fall term. He passes four or five units of whatever, he just walks in and competes his second year and he's done. He's passed 29 units in three semesters in Lord knows what; and in the spring term, he's automatically eligible. This is absurd legislation.

Stephen R. Morgan (NCAA): It sounds to me like the biggest problem with that scenario is an institutional one. You can't have legislation that addresses all aspects of keeping athletes eligible academically. If you have an institutional rule that permits a student to pass with only five hours in the fall to continue to participate, that's the institution's problem. I think this was an attempt to set only a minimum national floor, and I don't believe this really substantially alters the existing satisfactory-progress rule.

I think it makes it simpler administratively, because you certify everybody at one time. Most institutions have found that there are very few true spring-sport-only athletes anymore, because of the fall competition. Even if it's informal, there is fall competition in virtually all sports. So there are a limited number of athletes who would be eligible only in the spring. This was thought to be an administrative simplification that would make the rule easier to understand. Since its adoption, the rule has grown in the books and in its interpretations to be much more substantial than was conceived by its original sponsors.

So I think we can't lose sight of the fact that institutions still have to regulate the academic role of their students on their campuses and shouldn't be considering people to have a free pass if they are not students during the academic year.

Mr. Barkey: I don't know how many institutions' CEOs would agree with that. I don't think we need to tell a student that you are clearly eligible under the new satisfactory-progress legislation, but we are not going to let you play because we don't agree with the NCAA legislation. Therefore, you are not going to be able to play this spring because you only passed five units in the fall even though you were declared eligible for the entire academic term at the opening of the fall term.

Also, you will find a situation where you may penalize a 3.800 student averaging 12-plus units per term but who did not pass 24 the previous academic year for one reason or another. You will have a very, very good student who will not have passed 24 units the previous academic year but is well over the 12-unit average and has a 3.500 GPA.

And the current satisfactory-progress legislation is one of the small pieces of legislation that hasn't been very difficult to understand. This may seem to you to simplify things, but it hasn't been too difficult to understand in the past.

That just isn't right, and it shouldn't be put on the institutions to take those students out when the national legislation says they are eligible.

Christ Petrouleas [Wayne State University (Michigan)]: Regarding the change that would make this bylaw to read "the previous regular fall term," does that apply for the student's previous regular fall term or the institution's?

Mr. Green: Institution's.

Mr. Petrouleas: Therefore, if a student dropped out, he would then have to go to the one-time exemption for the dropout? If a student had to drop out a second time, he would not be eligible?

Mr. Green: I believe that is correct.

Charles A. Layne (Rochester Institute of Technology): Does this legislation mean that in the senior year of college a student who is declared eligible could compete the entire year without attending any classes? Didn't we have a case in a recent bowl game where a football player was eligible to play in one of the bowl games in a similar situation? Does this legislation not tend to be a little too lenient?

Mr. Green: It is no more lenient than our present legislation. I believe it's totally unchanged. The young man, as I understand, is registered and was eligible. Declaration of the eligibility at the present time lasts throughout the season.

Mr. Layne: In other words, the only legislation that is meaningful is the

institution's legislation in this regulation.

Mr. Green: That's right. Let me point out as a president and one who has been a fairly active member of this Association for some five or six years, my own personal judgment is that the NCAA can't do all, can't usurp or take over or replace institutional responsibility. There is a great deal of concern that the NCAA has a large and complex body of regulations; and I would submit to you, and it is merely a personal point of view, that had institutions shown the more responsible approach and had been willing to make some difficult decisions, the rules probably would be a lot shorter and simpler.

Richard W. Graves (California State University, Bakersfield): What I am concerned about is, as a practicing faculty athletics representative, that we are talking now in terms of work load. If this, in fact, means that at some early date in the year—late August, early September—I must have certified completely all of my athletes for the entire year, I think it's going to be very difficult just in terms of the time involved. Secondly, we do have distinct seasons; and for a sport such as track and field, the athletes presented to me by the coach in the fall is really not a very meaningful list.

Now, if, in fact, we mean we are going to certify based on the academic year, I have no problem with that. The question is, do I then have to submit some document to the NCAA saying that these are the track and field athletes that are going to be eligible, and do I have to do that on September 1?

Mr. Green: You do have the basis of the previous year's academic work. You don't submit anything to the NCAA.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): As a faculty athletics representative, I would ask how many institutions in this room determine eligibility on a semester-by-semester basis? At our school, we determine eligibility each semester. So, a basketball player is evaluated the first week in January; and if his progress that semester wasn't satisfactory, he's ineligible for the rest of the year in basketball. And that's true for all of our sports.

Gary Cunningham (California State University, Fresno): I am also a little concerned about the time. Is the intent of this legislation such that the eligibility process for all sports must be done in the early part of the fall quarter? In fact, we have tennis and track and baseball that realistically are only spring sports. We check quarter by quarter. If that eligibility process begins in the early part of the fall, it's almost moot by late spring. I am really concerned about the time. Does it mean one calendar year, or does it mean for every single sport that this must be done in the first part of the fall quarter?

Mr. Green: The intent was that every sport would be done in the fall quarter, with the option that students who were ineligible in the beginning of the fall quarter can become eligible during the term.

Howard Elwell (Gannon University): Maybe I can help just a little bit. The certification would be prior to the student competing or participating. You don't have to do it on September 1. You can do it October, November 1, if you wanted to. But, it would be based upon his latest academic year and only certified prior to his starting to participate.

Mr. Cunningham: All right, the question is, for example for baseball, which begins February 1, we have been doing that January 1 or January 10 or January 15—previous to the baseball season—taking into consideration the fall quarter. Would that process meet the intent of the legislation?

Mr. Green: Absolutely.

Mr. Cunningham: Well that's not the fall quarter.

Mr. Elwell: I understand. But still you would use his previous academic year to certify input when you do. It really is no matter as long as it's prior to the student participating or competing in that current academic year in his sport.

Mr. Cunningham: Well, what would happen to fall-quarter grades in that situation?

Mr. Elwell: You would have to consider them unless your institutional policy would allow you not to.

Ade L. Sponberg (North Dakota State University): Proposal No. 47 is a Division I only piece of legislation designed to get boosters out of the recruiting process in its entirety. No. 48 is designed to meet the original goal of the Recruiting Committee to limit recruiting in all sports to four months. In order to accomplish this, No. 48 was developed to limit the football evaluation to the month of November and two weeks in May, 7th to the 21st. It will limit the contact period from December 1 to the Saturday following the signing date. Now, there is an amendment before you changing the evaluation period, or as it's referred to, the scouting period back to September 1 from November 1. The committee will oppose that, because we just added back in two more months. The idea is to get the coaches off the road during the football season. It's cost effective, we believe; and while there may be some opposition to it, in the final analysis, it's designed to meet the goal of a four-month recruiting period.

The second one, No. 49, deals with basketball. It does the same thing in trying to get to the four-month limit. It will limit basketball evaluation to June 10 to June 31, December 11 to December 31 and February 8th to the last day of the month. Then the contact period will be from September 17th to October 7th and from March 1 to the Saturday following the signing date. There is an amendment to that piece of legislation that will accommodate women's basketball in those states that play the basketball season for women in the fall.

Mr. Green: Turning to Proposal Nos. 50, 51, and 52, these are part of a package proposed by a special committee of the Council to review the outside income of coaches.

Proposal No. 50 would require that the contract between the coach and an institution must provide that the coach will inform the chief executive officer regarding all athletically related income received by coaching staff members from sources outside the institution. It places no limits on the income that should be required in its performance.

No. 51 would prohibit the use of the institution's name or logo in the endorsement of commercial products or services for personal gain by athletics department staff members without the prior approval from the involved institution.

No. 52 would require an athletics department staff member to obtain approval from the institution's chief executive officer before receiving compensation from shoe apparel or equipment manufacturers in exchange for the use of such merchandise during practice or competition.

Paige E. Mulhollan (Wright State University): With respect to No. 50, there is a substantial amendment in the amendments list that perhaps should be mentioned because it changes the entire intent of the legislation

as originally proposed and is certainly worth discussing as a matter to which everyone should give consideration and perhaps debate before tomorrow.

Mr. Green: It requires only the source and not the amount of the income. That is an important change. If you support No. 50 strongly, you would want to vote against the amendment to No. 51 when it's offered tomorrow.

No. 53 is a related proposal but somewhat different. This prohibits an athletics department staff member from personal gain in return for scheduling intercollegiate athletics contests or arranging for a particular student-athlete to participate in an event. This has been a growing problem. For example, an institution that is endeavoring to build its program, in some instances, has offered compensation to the coach of a major team to come and play so it would gain stature and recognition. There appear to have been instances in which the authorities that govern, for example, a new coliseum or arena have said, in effect, "We will pay you if you will bring your team and schedule an event in our arena." And the committee felt that this practice ought to be prohibited.

The others require prior approval or reporting. I would point out that with reference to No. 50, a question was raised and discussed at the Council meeting last night pointing out that some coaches have contracts with three to five years left to run. One of our conclusions was that this proposal could not void an existing contract; it would not be retroactive unless there was mutual consent between the coach and the institution.

No. 54 relates to Division I only. No. 55 relates to enforcement and is part of a package advanced by the Committee on Infractions to be viewed by the Council and submitted to the Convention in an effort to improve the present enforcement procedure. No. 55 would require the enforcement staff to review with the Committee on Infractions the status of the investigation that has not been brought to a conclusion at the end of one year. It would authorize the committee to determine whether further investigation is warranted, to so notify the involved institutions and require additional status reports at six-month intervals. This was intended to deal with the problem where there is an infraction or a probable infraction and because of time pressure or other reasons, the issue was not brought to a head at the end of the year. This was an effort on the part of the committee to reach a conclusion at that point in time as to whether or not it should continue to keep the institution under the cloud for an indefinite period.

No. 56 provides that once an institution's written response has been submitted in cases involving allegations of major violations, the NCAA enforcement staff would prepare a summary statement for the Committee on Infractions and the representatives of the institution, containing all the information upon which it will rely in presenting its case and give the involved individuals an opportunity to review those memoranda and documents. This is an effort to eliminate a nagging question that from time to time has challenged the due process procedures of the enforcement procedure.

No. 57 simply provides that once an infraction report has been received by the institution, the report with names and other identifying information deleted will be made available to the wire services and other media. This is clearly an effort to deal with the problem of local press, which when an institution is involved in an infraction frequently generates a great deal of

raw data and writes not only about the problem of whether or not there was an infraction, but all kinds of misleading and erroneous reports. The committee feels that at this stage, once it has delivered the report to the institution, subject to some minor limitations, it should be released to the media.

No. 58 authorizes members of the enforcement staff to make public statements that correct erroneous or incomplete information about the investigation that has been made public by the institution. At the present time, the enforcement staff is restricted in its right to comment on pending enforcement matters; and there have been instances in which, inadvertently or otherwise, institutions have released statements that were misleading. This would enable the staff to correct those or submit more complete information.

No. 59 is a fairly simple piece of legislation. It is a constitutional amendment that would extend the same right of participation by the Presidents Commission in the appointment of an executive director as currently enjoyed by the Council. The present requirement is that the Executive Committee shall employ an executive director with the approval of the Council. No. 59 simply inserts the authority for the Presidents Commission. What happened was that when the Presidents Commission was established, we were simply not anticipating the possibility of a search for an executive director.

Nos. 60 and 61 deal with financial audits. The Council is on record as opposing No. 60, which would eliminate the requirement that the annual financial audit be conducted by an outside individual or agency. No. 61 would exclude from the audit requirement member institutions with annual operating budgets for athletics of less than \$300,000, excluding staff salaries. If I understand correctly, along with No. 60, this is being opposed by the Presidents Commission.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): As the author and representing the Northern California Athletic Conference, I believe this is being opposed by the Presidents Commission; and I understand the Big Ten is going to oppose it. It is presented because of the fact that most Division III and a good number of Division II members will not have an operating budget that exceeds that figure. The current bids we have on that independent audit are \$4,500. That's an exorbitant price to pay to audit nickel-dime \$200,000 athletics programs.

We are a nonscholarship Division II institution in the Northern California Athletic Conference, and all of us are going to have operating budgets under that figure. Our presidents are more than concerned about an annual audit that is going to add \$4,000 to \$5,000 to a program of that nature, and this is why we are hoping that we can have some support for No. 61.

Mr. Green: Let me respond by pointing out that the Association in developing guidelines for the audit has said, in effect, that the institution can do a great deal of the work internally so long as that work is subject to review by an outside auditor who certifies its validity and so forth. We have tried to take steps to reduce the cost. There are going to be some costs remaining; let's put it that way. Nos. 62 and 63 relate only to Division I.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Now we come to the first of the matters upon which we will vote. Again, I would remind you that the vote will be by roll call; and I will review the pro-

cedure with you before we vote.

Now, let me try to explain the three proposals and then we will ask the sponsors to move forward with them.

No. 64 quite simply was advanced by the Presidents Commission, which was working at the same point in time as the Division II Steering Committee to consider the problem of initial eligibility in Division II, and would establish the same standards of initial eligibility in Division II as currently exists in Division I. The essential difference is the test-score requirements. Nos. 64 and 66 are identical except for the test-score requirements.

No. 66, which is offered by the Division II Steering Committee, does not mandate the test-score requirements but rather the score curriculum only along with satisfactory progress that is already in place.

No. 65 is a proposal that incorporates standards adopted by the Gulf South Conference a year ago and that were submitted for consideration by the Council. It has a test score less rigorous than the test scores in No. 64.

Eligibility—Initial Qualifier

Del D. Weber (University of Nebraska, Omaha): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 64.

[The motion was seconded.]

Raymond M. Burse (Kentucky State University): I move for reordering of the agenda for Proposal No. 66 to be considered first.

[The motion was seconded and failed to receive two-thirds approval.]

Bob Moorman (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 64-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Just in case that somebody doesn't know what it says, I will explain that we want to eliminate the test scores and add an effective date of 1988. That is what we're looking for.

Larry Trussell (University of Nebraska, Omaha): The previous motion to consider No. 66 prior to No. 64 was defeated. Amendment 64-1 does the same thing. I guess I'd like to ask for a ruling from the parliamentarian on No. 64-1.

Mr. Green: The parliamentarian advises us that the amendment is in order.

Bob Vanatta (Sunshine State Conference): My conference would like to speak strongly against the amendment for the simple reason that it seems to cut the heart out of Proposal No. 64. So we are definitely and strongly opposed to the amendment.

Mr. Moorman: That's exactly what we want to do, cut the heart out of No. 64. I think one thing that is very important for us to remember is that when the big boys in Division I had a 2,000 requirement, no one seemed to care what we had. Now, all of a sudden, Bylaw 5-1-(j) has excited everybody and they feel that we need to have some restraints on us. I think one of the important things in Division II is that we have been graduating people. We haven't given any \$2,500 bonuses to sign. We haven't moved families back and forth. We haven't given any automobiles. I don't understand what all the excitement is about to get academics in the book when we always have had academics.

What you are saying, a lot of people are saying, is that Division II doesn't try to graduate the student-athlete; but we do. We have young people come into our institutions who might not necessarily have test scores of 700 or a

15; however, they have gone on to participate in athletics and have become doctors, dentists, lawyers, mayors. We have had army colonels and army generals. These people seem to have gotten along perfectly well without having the restriction of Bylaw 5-1-(j).

If some of these kids had had the restrictions that some people want to put on them right now, they would not have gotten into the institution, primarily because we cannot afford to stack up people like they are doing in Division I. If a guy doesn't meet the qualification, they put him in for a year and wait around and then he's going to play next year. You all know several instances of this case. However, we cannot afford to bring a kid into school unless he's going to participate. I think this is a very important factor when you are thinking about restricting us to the programs that we have, programs that you want.

Our practice sessions are not in the same category as Division I institutions. For example, I think for most of us in here if a kid has to take a lab class or some other class after three or four o'clock in the afternoon, he's just going to miss practice. This doesn't happen in Division I. We already are thinking about academics; we don't have to have anything in the book that is going to restrict an individual from getting into an institution where he might not get a chance to participate, might not ever get into college.

Right now, if a fellow or a young lady does not meet the requirements of Division I, he or she at least can go to Division II. Our satisfactory-progress rules are tight now, so we are not going to have a person sliding through and not getting the academics.

Jimmy C. Stokes (West Georgia College): Assuming that this amendment has been ruled proper, would the sponsors of the amendment please educate us as to the difference between No. 64 as amended and No. 66?

Mr. Moorman: As it's amended right now, there is no difference. If it was not amended, you discuss 64 first, and then 65 and then got around to 66. We want you to discuss 66 right now; that's why it's being amended.

Bruce A. Samson (University of Tampa): Our conference presidents unanimously went on record in support of Proposal No. 64. We feel very strongly; it's a very simple issue. We should have comparable initial qualification with Division I, and the issue is one of priorities. We feel very strongly that the education of potential student-athletes is the issue. We feel that competing on a comparable basis with the Division I is the way to approach that.

George W. Schubert (University of North Dakota): I also rise to speak in favor of the motion. We always talk about academics and athletics, and I think we have reached the point in Division II where we are kidding ourselves if we think we are not going to have student-athletes who are not eligible in Division I moving to Division II. I think if we look at what's happened already this year, we have seen students who are not eligible under Division I rules coming to Division II and participating. I don't know what has happened to those student-athletes, and perhaps we will be finding out in the near future. We are academic institutions first, and I think this rule will support that position.

Arend D. Lubbers (Grand Valley State College): I think that every system can be subverted; and I think that as we have looked at our experience in the NCAA, we have found institutions that find unique ways to undermine the rules or circumvent them. I think that the more safeguards that

we can put into our legislation, the better we will be served. Frankly, I think that a national test score is going to be a better safeguard than just a grade-point average and satisfactory progress. Division II has so many divisions within it and so many different kinds of institutions with differing admission policies and retention policies that one thing that a test score gives us is a sameness nationally. We will have some guarantee that we will be in competition with institutions that are fielding athletes of the same caliber and of the same quality. It's an extra safeguard and one I believe we need. For myself, personally—and I suppose each institution has its own attitude toward this—I feel that as a division we can earn the reputation as a dumping ground. Whether that's true or not, I don't know. For my institution, I think we are as good as anyone academically; and I don't want the policies that govern our athletics program or the athletics policies of the institution against which we compete to give any indication that we are not as serious about our academic program as those in Division I.

Here we find ourselves in a debate long after they have launched their way toward a solution. I would hope that we would meet the same problems at approximately the same time.

Lloyd D. Vincent (Angelo State University): I am chair of the Council Presidents of the Lone Star Conference. I speak for both my institution and for the conference in opposing the amendment and endorsing as a cosponsor of Proposal No. 64. I might mention that these decisions in our conference were not arrived at lightly. They were deliberated on with several that were concerned with the academic integrity for equity within the conference as well as in Division II of the NCAA.

Clifford F. Sjogren (University of Michigan): I want to remind the assembly here that Bylaw 5-1-(j) as it's applied to Division I is definitely working, and it's working very well in spite of a lot of controversy that has accompanied this legislation. As chair of the Academic Requirements Committee, I have been in contact with secondary school people throughout the country and with the National Association of Secondary School principals in Washington; and they are absolutely delighted with what's happening. Furthermore, the Academic Requirements Committee has greatly improved the administration of Bylaw 5-1-(j); and it's going to be much easier both for the secondary people and for the college people. It seems to me now that the only flaw that we have, the only possibility for not encouraging young athletes in the seventh, eighth and ninth grades from taking good courses in high school and developing excellent skills in mathematics and verbal areas, which is so necessary in the collegiate world, is that coaches and counselors and others can tell them at this point that if you can't make it in Division I, you can always go to Division II. I think that's the only flaw we have in there. So as chair of this committee and as one who is very much in touch with the secondary school people in this issue, I would urge you to vote for No. 64 and vote against the amendment.

James E. Lyons (Bowie State College): I opposed the use of the SAT examination for determining athletics eligibility as a vice president of a Division I school because it was a misuse of the test, and it is. And I now oppose it as president of a Division II school. I do speak in favor of the amendment, and I want to correct a notion that being opposed to the misuse of the SAT examination should not imply that we are opposed to rigid academic standards. I think that somehow we have gotten off into a notion that

if you oppose an obvious misuse of the test, and I think the test makers themselves have gone on record indicating this, that you are opposed to academic standards.

Now, throughout the state of Maryland, we find our local school districts are now requiring a curriculum and our state board for higher education has mandated that we beef up our admission requirements. Many of our public schools are now requiring competency tests and performance tests. Many of our faculties are looking at academic standards. This is the way to go. If we want to beef up academic standards, these are academic matters; and I believe that our boards, that our institutions, that our faculties, that our public schools ought to do it. Using the SAT and the ACT, which is designed only to predict the performance of the students during his first year in school, to determine initial athletics eligibility is a misuse of the test; and I would urge that we vote in favor of the amendment to eliminate the test and leave these matters to the faculties at our institutions.

Phillip W. Conn (Central Missouri State University): I am speaking in favor of the amendment. Quite frankly I am speaking opposed to Nos. 64, 65, and 66. I feel that in our rush to demonstrate that we are tough on academics, we are forgetting some more basic principles. At my institution, I am responsible not only for individual athletics, but for admissions. To me, admission to colleges and the standards for admission are the responsibility and prerogative of the individual colleges and institutions represented here. Someone before me indicated that we should be the same, or we are the same. We are not. We are public, we are private, we are large, we are small, we are regional, we are land-grant. This imposition—this intrusion—with a motion that would say that the NCAA determines admissions standards for a category of our students, in my opinion, is wrong headed.

We have admission standards; we are proud of those standards. We believe in high academic standards. In fact, we graduate far more of our student-athletes than we do our student body as a whole. However, for us to have admission standards for our students in general different from those standards for student-athletes is to discriminate against student-athletes. To us, admission standards should be admission standards, and student-athletes should be allowed to participate if they are admitted as students would be in any other extracurricular activity.

William T. O'Hara (Bryant College): Speaking for the Northeast-Eight Conference, I would like to go on record in support of No. 64. I think it's important that we all keep in mind as we look at legislation of this nature that none of us, individually or as individual conferences, operates in a vacuum. Today, there is no question about it; even though we have taken significant steps, especially through the work of the Presidents Commission, to remedy many of the defects that are related and associated with intercollegiate athletics in the United States, there continues to be a crisis in confidence. In fact, our individual institutions will put academic priorities and standards ahead of emphasis on athletics. It's important that we continue to communicate this kind of message throughout the United States.

Hugh C. Bailey (Valdosta State College): I think the argument against using the SAT to put a minimum floor for admission to athletics programs is the same argument we have heard for 30 years about using SAT for admission to institutions. But with all of its defects, it does have a validity within the entire spectrum and it is very useful. I think testing is one of the

most controversial subjects, especially uniform testing, that ever arises. But nevertheless, we have not been able to find a substitute that is better than the college boards or the SAT. I do think it is absolutely essential that we adopt some standard for Division II at this Convention. All of us are on trial, our institutions are on trial, our integrity is on trial; and I do hope that we will defeat the amendment and vote for No. 64.

Charles A. Lyons Jr. (Fayetteville State University): Let me say at the outset that our institution strongly supports academic standards. I think we need to be very clear that to eliminate the test score does not necessarily mean that we don't support standards. I think we are losing sight of the most important part of what's being put forward and that is the curricular aspects of both Proposal No. 64 and No. 66 and the grade-point average. It seems to me that we, in presenting No. 64 with the test score, have picked up a solution that was devised for Division I, with all of the problems that Bylaw 5-1-(j) was designed to address in Division I, and are bringing it over to Division II to address circumstances that don't exist here. I would like to see us, as Division II, devise solutions to our problems that fit the circumstances. I believe that we can support standards by supporting the core curriculum and the grade-point average and eliminating the test score. I agree with President Lyons from Bowie State. I think it's a misuse of tests.

Arthur W. Herriott (Florida International University): Division II has a serious problem, I think, with media relations and is facing a second-class image with its athletics. And I hate to see us go on record as having a lower standard than Division I.

Donald J. Schmidt (Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne): It appears to me that if we do not adopt the same academic guidelines as Division I, tomorrow morning, in our local newspapers on the editorial page in the news section, the headlines will read, Division II adopts watered-down academic requirements. The public perception to that will be that our academic programs are not on the same caliber as Division I. We know that is not true. However, the public perception of that will be as I indicated. I feel it's important to us to be able to hold our heads high academically, and Proposal No. 64 will do this. I would urge you to defeat the amendment on that basis. I do not believe that any of us belong to second-class institutions, and I think the public should recognize that we do not belong to second-class institutions. And, therefore, our academic requirements in the athletic area should be the same as Division I.

Raymond M. Burse (Kentucky State University): I rise to speak in favor of the amendment to the amendment. And I rise to speak for several reasons. No. 1, my institution, a state public institution was founded on the basis of access and opportunity. I think there are many institutions in this room that are founded on the very same basis. For that reason, I think we owe an obligation to our institutions to maintain that access and opportunity for everyone within those institutions.

One of the things that I often have heard stated about the NCAA whenever we talk about limitation on student-athletes is that we always say we don't want to do more for our student-athletes than we do for the other students. I think when you talk about admission standards that there shouldn't be any differentiation between the admission standards for athletes in your institution and for the regular students themselves. I think it's critical, and I think we need to focus on that. Someone said earlier that if we

don't adopt what Division I has adopted, that somehow we will have adopted watered-down standards. I would submit that the problem to be addressed in Division I was a very serious problem that required a very serious remedy. The problem to be addressed in Division II has not risen to the level that is the same kind of problem that exists in Division I. I agree that before we leave from this Convention this time that Division II should adopt some academic standards. I think the core curriculum and the required 2.000 are what is necessary.

Lest we forget, folks, lest we forget, I don't know how many of you have seen copies of the impact study done for Division I prior to last year's Convention in terms of how did the test scores imposed impact on minority students. Based on minority students that have been enrolled in those institutions, I think it was for a three- or four-year time period previous to the study, some 44 to 50 percent of the minority students at those institutions would not have been eligible for intercollegiate athletics at those institutions. We do not need to send that kind of message to minorities across this country in terms of Division II.

Now, let's get down to the nitty-gritty of it all. The Bylaw 5-1-(j) that you read in your Manual and the 5-1-(j) that is applied in Division I are two different beasts. I sit on the NCAA Council. Every time we come to a meeting, Division I has 50 or 60 questions on 5-1-(j) that have to be resolved. At the rate they are going, we probably will need a new Manual just for Bylaw 5-1-(j). There have been some interpretations placed on 5-1-(j) that I think the majority of the people in Division II would find very distasteful. Particularly, those who talk about academic standards and maintaining them.

You find that we now have a division where a student can take the test on two different occasions and choose the highest subscore in each of the tests. When you adopt, or if you adopt and do not support this amendment, what you basically do is bring along all the interpretations placed on 5-1-(j) by Division I. I don't think that's what you want to do. And because of that, I think we should be cautious in the way that we proceed in terms of addressing the needs of Division II by adopting the core curriculum and by adopting the 2.000 grade-point average that is required.

I have asked the question why Proposal No. 64 for Division II. And the answer I have gotten more often than not is that we don't want Division II to become a dumping ground. No one has been able to point to any statistics that show that Division II has become a dumping ground for Division I. Has anybody ever bothered to ask why? It is because big money bags support for Division I obviously in some way or the other is providing money for student-athletes that attend the Division I school under the pretense of paying their own way to maintain their eligibility, and they don't end up in our institution. Tell me how many of these kids who didn't qualify on 5-1-(j) have the \$8,000, \$10,000, \$12,000 and \$14,000 that are necessary to go to some of these schools? They are not in my school, and I don't think they are in the majority of the schools in this room.

So, I would urge you to take a cautious approach on the issue of Bylaw 5-1-(j). Let Division II take the step of a core curriculum with a 2.000 grade-point average. If we need to do something more after a year of thorough review and study, we can come back to the 1988 Convention and adopt it.

Thomas L. Knauss (Northern Michigan University): I would like to add two additional points to what has been said this morning but from a differ-

ent perspective. Someone mentioned earlier that by adopting No. 64—1, the amendment to the amendment, we would be taking the heart out of No. 64. From my point of view the heart remains in No. 64 with 11 core courses and the 2,000 requirement.

At my institution, I have had the responsibility for many years to adopt and design and implement and supervise what we call an Athlete's Placement Program. A computer-based program that predicts final course grades in a variety of courses for freshmen. The best predictors of success come from high school achievement scores. We have been an ACT institution since 1966. The contributions that ACT scores made to this prediction equation is not significant.

The other point I'd like to make is that we have one Division I sport. So we have some experience with Bylaw 5-1-(j). The problem that we see in addition to what the previous speaker has mentioned is that procedural testing is not permitted. Now, what that means to us in Division II is that if a student attends your institution, happens to take the ACT or SAT score at one of the regional make-up sites during the summer, that score is not usable to declare eligibility. The student must take it on a national testing date. If your institution is very similar to ours, we have students deciding to attend maybe late spring or early summer, happen to find enough money to pay for the tuition and fees and they might be a walk on. But if they happen to take the ACT test during the summer, it's too bad. We must declare them ineligible.

Thomas E. Hendrix (Grand Valley State College): Recently, I spoke at an advisors group, and they asked about the passage of No. 48 last year. It made me feel good, because I said this is the best legislation that has been passed in the NCAA in the last 30 years. It's the first time that anybody has passed legislation with an outlook for the welfare of the student at hand. Of course, that was passed by Division I. There has been nothing said here about a kid not being able to go to college. That's the most important issue. They are allowed to attend classes, participate in everything except giving up two, three, four hours a day for athletics. Their education is allowed to continue, their financial aid is allowed to continue.

I think it's foolish to try and have youngsters come into school, having a disadvantage and ask them to practice and play.

Walter Bowman (Chapman College): I wish to speak against the amendment and in favor of No. 64. And I will address or limit my comments to the so-called controversial tests. To achieve the minimum scores on the SAT and ACT examinations, a student must successfully complete between 30 and 40 percent of the questions. Put another way, he or she may fail on 60 percent or more of the questions and still achieve these minimum scores.

I would like to ask the ladies and gentlemen in this room a series of questions, very quick ones. One, to the athletics representatives: How many of you would pass a student in your course who achieved less than a 40 percent on that course? To the coaches: How many of you would play or even suit up or even have on the team a player who graded out consistently at under 40 percent? And to the athletics directors and presidents: How many of you would retain a coach who consistently made poor or inappropriate selections in more than 60 percent of the athletes he brought to your school on athletics scholarships?

[Proposal No. 64-1 (Page A-48) was defeated by Division II (63-100).]

Bob Moorman (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): On behalf of members of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association and the Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association, I move for the adoption of No. 64-2.

[The motion was seconded.]

A lot of institutions have already recruited based on our present standards. That is for basketball in the early session. This amendment would change the effective date from August 1, 1987 to August 1, 1988. One of our biggest problems is the fact that the high school institutions have not really caught up even with Bylaw 5-1-(j). Right now, the seniors and the juniors in the high school system are going to have a difficult time in many instances meeting the criteria. We already had one student at Oklahoma who had a 3.400 and couldn't get in because of test scores.

Tom D. Morgan (California Collegiate Athletic Association): We are one of the regional people that petitioned for No. 64, but we asked for the date of 1988 rather than 1987. And the reason for our support—and we would support, of course, this amendment—is that 1988 was the date we felt that the high schools would be geared up and be better informed by the NCAA.

[Note: After extensive discussion, it was agreed that Proposal No. 64-2 if adopted would move all dates in Proposal No. 64 to 1988 and 1989 rather than 1987 and 1988.]

[Proposal No. 64-2 (Page A-48) was approved by Division II.]

Mr. Green: I have a personal position on Proposal No. 64, as well as one from the Steering Committee. I am going to ask Ade Sponberg, who was our president a year ago to assume the chair while I go down to the microphone and speak at an appropriate time.

Ade L. Sponberg (North Dakota State University): Any further discussion on Proposal No. 64?

Bob Moorman (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): I think most of you were present when we were in San Diego voting on Proposal No. 48. One of the things that I am trying to emphasize and it's been brought out, I think, this morning is that this is not a black and white issue. I think one of the problems with No. 48 was it became a black and white issue. And one of the main points that I made right in this same hotel is the fact that a lot of young underprivileged white kids will be affected by this as well as the minorities. The person who is affected is the youngster that is not able to go to an institution. The only way he can attend is by scholarship, athletics scholarship. If you pass No. 64, he will not be able to go to school. He can't go unless he's a blue chipper, of course. Then he's going to be kept back, but we cannot do that. Consequently, a lot of kids instead of going to school will go out and get a job. When they begin working, they do not get back into the flow. Arnold Palmer in his speech, brought out the fact that he wouldn't have gotten into Winston-Salem State University. Of course, you know what he's done, not only for the university in Winston-Salem, but also for young people all over. So I am very much speaking in opposition to Proposal No. 64.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): Over the last three years, the Division II Steering Committee has spent a great deal of time looking at the issue of academic standards. We feel that it is important that Division II have adequate standards, but we also are concerned that we not overreact

to the problem. If you look back in history when Division I adopted "Proposition 48" with the test-score cutoffs, there were frequent reports in the press of abuses in Division I. And clearly, Division I wanted to send a dramatic and immediate signal that it was going to end those abuses. I think in that respect it worked.

My concern is that I do not believe and am not convinced that Division II at this point in time requires the test-score cutoff. In the first place, the problem of abuse has never been as great in Division II, particularly in terms of recruiting patterns. I have encountered few reports in Division II through the years that indicate that any coach or coaches systematically are disregarding academic standards in their recruiting practices.

Rather, I think what happens is that they sometimes get an exceptional athlete on the team who may not do well; and they may be inclined to fudge a little bit on that score. I don't think that there is evidence that Division II has become a dumping ground for the rejects from Division I. It's clear, for example, that the real blue chip athletes are still being signed by Division I with larger budgets and larger scholarship limits. They are able to sign a number of these people even given the fact that they cannot compete or participate in their freshman year and given the uncertainty as to whether or not they will achieve satisfactory progress.

It appears and it would seem logical indeed, as someone pointed out earlier, that there is some correlation between the requirement for completion of the core curriculum of the 2.000 grade-point average and test scores. To what extent that correlation exists, I don't know. But a number of coaches have said to me that if they find students who have completed the core curriculum with that grade-point average, they generally have the test scores and vice versa. Surely, there have been some reports of, again, individual coaches who have sought out a student-athlete who was not eligible for Division I; but I don't think the problem is widespread.

My own feeling is that given the core curriculum combined with the tight enforcement of the satisfactory-progress rule, the question of test scores will become moot in three to four years. Coaches are not, if they are held to the satisfactory-progress rule, likely to sign athletes and invest the limited scholarship money that we have in Division II.

My basic concern ought to be and is, I think, oriented toward the graduation of our student-athletes. I think the satisfactory-progress requirement more directly and more positively relates to that purpose than does the test-score cutoff. One other point is that it seems to me that when we talk about initial eligibility, we are getting very close to the same kind of situation that you have had in the debate through the years on whether or not freshmen ought to compete at all in intercollegiate athletics. There are studies that clearly indicate that the burden of practice and competition in some instances adversely affects the student-athlete. But for every one of those studies, there is probably a balancing study that shows that the motivation and discipline of participation in competition in intercollegiate athletics encourage and support the marginal student in achieving his maximum potential. I think we can argue that either way.

In the final analysis, it comes down to the attitude of the coach and, if you will, the academic tone of the institution. If our institutions make it clear to our coaches that we want our athletes to graduate, then I think we are going to see them graduate. If we don't take a strong institutional position

with we as presidents advocating our responsibility for overseeing this area, then we are going to see student-athletes make indifferent progress.

My own position through the years has always been that I ought not to judge our student-athletes by standards any less rigorous than those we apply to all of our students. On the other hand, I feel very strongly that I ought not to expect more of them unless it is essential to do so. In this instance, I am not convinced, in my own mind, that it is essential for us to adopt the test-score cutoff to achieve our purpose, and I would urge the defeat of Proposal No. 64. And at an appropriate time would endorse the adoption of Proposal No. 66.

Donald R. Gerth (California State University, Sacramento): One of the things I do in my spare time is to chair the admissions council of California State University, Sacramento; so I am familiar to a certain extent with some of the issues at hand. I speak only for myself and for my own campus at this moment. I would speak strongly in favor of the adoption of No. 64 as stated, and in contrast, therefore, to the previous speaker for a couple of reasons. I really don't think the issue before us has anything much to do with the core curriculum and test scores. It doesn't have to do with Division I and Division II relationships, nor does it have much to do with media relations or a whole bunch of other things that has been alleged this morning. I think what it has to do with is the character of universities and the character of university education and what it meant to be a student-athlete who is in any university in the year 1987. And that's different than what it means when I went to school.

This nation is in the midst of really a massive reform in the matter of preparation for a good college and university education. That reform is one which addresses rich and poor alike and members of all ethnic groups. It's a reform that is designed precisely, I think, to address the changing demographic character of our society. I think Proposal No. 64 as it's stated before us is in the mainstream of that reform; and I would urge that all of us from Division II colleges and universities, in a sense, declare our athletics programs to be in the mainstream of that reform. Therefore, I urge the adoption of the proposal.

Arend D. Lubbers (Grand Valley State College): I just wanted to mention among other things that this is really the only central and most important issue that the Division II Presidents Commission members centered on for this meeting. With perhaps one or two exceptions, I think the members of the Commission have felt more strongly than they have on almost every other issue that it was imperative for the Association to pass No. 64.

Earlier when I spoke, I talked about the schools becoming a dumping ground; and a comment was made just a few minutes ago that indicated that none of our schools was accepting the dumping-ground label. Well, it certainly would be out of place for me to name names; but I must say that to my knowledge I could name three institutions where that very thing happened. The castoffs who didn't make the test scores were picked up by Division II institutions, and it caused some difficulty. I don't think that our institutions can afford to be second-class academic citizens. I think that if we do not pass No. 64, we are in danger of having that label. Whether correct or not, that's what I think the view will be of all of us.

James E. Lyons (Bowie State College): I am speaking against No. 64. We do not require it of freshmen who enter our institution to participate in

the marching band that practices three hours a day, five and six hours a week to pass a minimum SAT score. We do not and would not require it of freshmen who enter our institution to participate in our college choir that practices two and three hours a day, several days a week. We would not require a standardized test score for freshmen who come in and work on our college newspaper any number of hours a week. And, therefore, we would not want to require a test score of our students who come in to participate in intercollegiate athletics.

Raymond M. Burse (Kentucky State University): Let me say, first of all, I don't consider my institution a second-rate institution. It is second to none when it comes to academic standards, even though there is the implication that if you somehow oppose No. 64 that you place your institution in that particular position. As the president of Kentucky State University, I choose to run my institution. I choose the autonomy to have that institution establish the principles and guidelines by which it operates. I think all too often in this Association rather than the institution accepting the responsibilities to abide by its own standards, we run to external organizations like the NCAA to establish those standards and guidelines for us; and I don't think it's necessary.

One of the things that was not mentioned earlier was that the Division II Steering Committee sent out a survey to the chief executive officers of all Division II institutions to try to determine what each institution's academic standards were in order to come to some consensus on what would make sense as a minimum for a standard to be applied in Division II. The consensus that came out of that survey was what has been embodied in Proposal No. 66, which is what makes sense for Division II.

When I said earlier that you all wouldn't want a number of the interpretations that have been placed on Bylaw 5-1-(j) by Division I, I meant that in all sincerity. I think there are some things that have been done with 5-1-(j)—like the partial qualifier and others—that you would find objectionable. If 5-1-(j) is the rule and you don't meet the standards, then you don't qualify. Why fall into middle ground? The partial qualifier is not found in the language of the proposal. But it's an interpretation placed on Bylaw 5-1-(j) by Division I.

I think that today this division needs to stand up and adopt something that makes sense for this group. I am as concerned about the student-athletes on my campus as all of you are on yours, but I am concerned about them as students in the entire student body of Kentucky State, not just as athletes. Therefore, I urge you to think long and hard and vote against No. 64 and support No. 66.

[Proposal No. 64 (Page A-47) was approved by Division II (roll-call vote; 97-70. See Appendix B) as amended by No. 64-2.]

Mr. Green: Now, if I may have your attention further. Adoption of Proposal No. 64 moots Proposal Nos. 65 and 66.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Academics

Moving on through the agenda, Proposal Nos. 67, 68, 69, 70, all relate to Division I only. Proposal No. 71 relates to Divisions I and II. It is an amendment to the satisfactory-progress rule proposed to permit a student-athlete who is considered by the certifying institution to be in good academic stand-

ing to avoid ineligibility under the satisfactory-progress rule that might result from missed terms of attendance. I might point out that we already have a process for one-time exception under controlled circumstances. Proposal No. 72 is a satisfactory-progress rule amendment that will be moot if Proposal No. 46 is adopted. Proposal No. 73 relates to Division I only.

Recruiting

Ade L. Sponberg (North Dakota State University): Proposal No. 74 is a Division I only proposal. Proposal No. 75 will be withdrawn. Proposal No. 76 is Division I only. And No. 77, the letter of intent for women's basketball, will establish a quiet period surrounding the initial opportunity to sign women basketball players 48 hours on either side of the initial signing in the spring. And that bylaw will need to be acted on by this division.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Letter of Intent—Women's Basketball

Mr. Chair, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 77, Part B.

[The motion was seconded.]

Bradford W. Hovious (Delta State University): Why is women's basketball singled out to be mailed; while with all the other sports, we can go sit down and sign them and answer questions? It doesn't seem to me that we would be saving a great deal by adopting this rule.

Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): Philosophically, we feel a period of time immediately surrounding the letter of intent gives the youngster a chance to just sit there and talk over the decision with her parents without coaches invading that period of time. It allows them time to just give some serious thought without any pressure. They certainly had the pressure up to that point. They have a period of time afterward where the coach can recontact them if that seemed to be necessary. Within that 48-hour period of time, it just gives them an opportunity to make some decisions they want to make in the privacy of their own home in a family situation.

Mr. Hovious: The question is why we have women's basketball singled out to not be pressurized. The mother and father can always say, "No, coach, I don't want you in my home"; and they can get some peace and quiet. We have singled out one sport here; and if they don't sign after 48 hours, then the coach is right back in there anyway. So it just seems like we are taking one particular set of circumstances where you can sign somebody and we are not doing anybody else's like that. Why not say we'll mail it out to every sport? I just couldn't understand why we singled out one single sport.

Betty Jaynes (Women's Basketball Coaches Association): I think I can speak for the Women's Basketball Coaches Association. Basically, our coaches at our convention felt a lot of the breaking of the rules occurred during that period of time, 48 hours before and 48 hours after the signing date. If you pass this quiet period, then the letter of intent would have to be included in a postal delivery and you couldn't have the personal appearance.

[Proposal No. 77, Part B (Page A-60) was defeated by Division II (77-82).]

Football Recruiting

Mr. Sponberg: I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 78, Part A.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 78 will bring Division II and Division III in line with Division I regarding football recruiting during the National Football Coaches Association convention.

Bradford W. Hovious (Delta State University): I want to speak against this for the basic reason that there ought to be some advantage to being poor. There are a great many of our football programs in Division II that don't send their coaches to the national convention, and this would just make them idle for about two or three days. I don't see that it's really needed in our division.

Mr. Green: As a president, I must say I hate a man that's idle.

Bob Moorman (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): Even if we go to the convention, sometimes we have to drive and not fly and we might be able to recruit on the way and on the way back. So, this is the biggest worry about that period; and I think we have to take advantage of any opportunity we have to recruit.

Jerry Vandergriff (Angelo State University): Most of our coaches are involved in classes. In fact, we have found we have less time and fewer coaches on our athletics staff. This would be taking time away from us when we are not involved in classes and where we might catch up with Division I.

[Proposal No. 78 (Page A-60) was defeated by Division II.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Recruiting

Ade L. Sponberg (North Dakota State University): Proposal No. 79 is a Division I-only issue. Proposal No. 80 will be withdrawn. Proposal No. 81 will be withdrawn. Proposal No. 82 will be withdrawn. Proposal No. 83 has been dubbed the Dooley amendment because it will permit the parents to watch the high school, junior college or all-star contest if his son or daughter is a participant.

Nos. 84 and 85 will be withdrawn. No. 86 is a Division I-only issue, and No. 87 is a Division I-only issue. No. 88 is the next one for our concern. The proposal calls for a limitation on the size and color of printed recruiting brochures. An amendment will withdraw the portion that talks about the 5½ by 9 size but will retain the single color requirement. No. 89 will permit the use of a recruiting poster. Again, No. 90 will allow high school awards at on-campus high school events. The last two, Nos. 91 and 92, are the tryout rule. As you recall several years ago, Division II had a tryout rule for about 20 minutes. No. 91 is proposed by the Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association, and No. 92 is sponsored by the Division II Steering Committee. The difference between the two is that No. 92 includes a requirement of written permission from the high school. It also includes soccer under Item 4, as one of those in which competition is disallowed and in football, the players shall not wear helmets or pads. Other than that, the two are primarily identical.

[Proposal No. 91 (Page A-67) was withdrawn.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Tryouts

Delegate: I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 92.

[The motion was seconded.]

Edward S. Steitz (Springfield College): Springfield College is opposed to this proposition. We recall some 35 and 40 years ago when the flesh peddlers came onto our campuses, irate parents standing outside the gymnasium wanting a decision as to what was happening, are their kids going to get the scholarship. In this time of litigation that is before us, if one of your athletes gets hurts, slips on a ball, you can rest assured you will have litigation on your hands immediately. We are unalterably opposed to this proposition.

Rudy Carvajal (California State University, Bakersfield): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I would like to point out that you haven't seen many problems in addressing Mr. Steitz' concerns relative to insurance problems. Anytime a student-athlete visits your campus and falls down or has any kind of other injury, it's still a problem. It is possible to have insurance that will cover this and not create a problem for you.

The legislation was proposed somewhat as a result of consideration of the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women tryout rule and also as a result of a possible cost saving to the membership in terms of recruiting. About 40 years ago, yes there were some problems, obviously; but this is our division, and we can create some rules and regulations to control them. If we are not satisfied with the controls we have, we can add or alter those rules.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): As a Division II Steering Committee alumnus, I'd like ask what you folks were on when you proposed this? I think that 20 minutes was far too long for this rule to have been in existence. I agree with Ed Steitz, except I think he was far too deferential. I think this is absurd.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): This has some serious complications from the standpoint of medical insurance. In spite of what my good friend Rudy says, it has some serious complications. When you start talking about insurance premiums and the insurance people ask you how many student-athletes you are going to have visit, and you say, well, we will have 400 or 500 students. Are you kidding, you want to cover those people, 400 or 500 people?

There are enormous complications in getting permission of principals for unexpected weekend visits. In Division II, I think we all have athletes that come in there for visitations on a one-hour notice and trying to get appropriate permission is at times very difficult. Spring sport athletes visit campuses before the conclusion of their spring sport season. I think most of you have track and field and baseball going well into the third or fourth week of May at times. They visit prior to that. They do not wait until June to make their first campus visit. Almost all those sport athletes would be ineligible for tryout. All the fall sport athletes would be perfectly eligible for tryouts, along with the winter sports athletes. I agree, there is no sense to this. There would be some terrible complications with this.

Ken B. Jones (Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association): Absurdity is often in the eyes of the beholder. I would remind members of Division II that three years ago this proposal, originated by the Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association, was passed; and its short longevity was not related to Division II, it was the involvement of other divisions in the final decision. The MIAA had proposed No. 91 this year, and we just withdrew it.

The reason it was withdrawn is that one of the basic stated arguments with our previous proposal was the objection of the National Federation of State High School Associations. Proposal No. 92 takes that into consideration. I gather that the executive secretary of the national federation was not opposed to No. 92; he simply wanted to have their athletics directors have the option of approving. I think this is an advantage and partially a reason we withdrew 91.

Ray Greene (Alabama A&M University): I am opposed to the tryout, but I'd like to make a point with regard to Division II practices and some of the things that go on in Division I. I think it goes back to some of the problems we have with Proposal No. 64. The Division I schools do try out people, but they have the alumni and other interested parties invite those athletes who they want to come to their summer camps and work them out there where it's legal, which is just as unfair to us.

I think that it would not make good sense to have tryouts because of the insurance problems and that sort of thing, but it does go in Division I. We have coattailed Division I with Proposal No. 64. I think that all of us who are in proximity to Division I schools know that. They bring the top athletes from all over the state or wherever to summer camps. Either they pay their own way or some alumni or somebody who is concerned with the Division I programs provides the athletes with the opportunity to go to summer camp where they are tried out legally.

Raymond M. Burse (Kentucky State University): For all those folks that voted for No. 64, there is a drug test waiting as you go out. For those who have a problem with No. 92, I would caution you to remember that it is permissive legislation. You do not have to do tryouts. This would only allow those that do not have problems with the insurance and all those other things the opportunity to do it.

[Proposal No. 92 (Page A-68) was defeated by Division II (78-86).]

[The Division II business session was recessed at 11:57 am.]

Thursday Afternoon, January 8, 1987

The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m., with Mr. Green presiding.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Financial Aid

Mr. Green: All right, we will resume our order of business beginning with Proposal No. 93.

Elwood N. Shields (Bentley College): Legislative Proposal No. 93 is a Division I-only issue, and it's our understanding that that may be withdrawn. Proposal Nos. 94, 95 and 96 also are Division I or Division I-AA issues, and we understand perhaps they will be withdrawn. You understand that there may be a challenge to these withdrawals.

No. 97 is for all divisions and is a common vote. The intent is to permit a student-athlete to receive an established institutional research grant that would be exempt from the financial aid limitations set forth in the Constitution 3-1-(g)-(1). I think the key word in there is an established institutional grant, and it's also one that must be granted in competition from among all students. It should not be too controversial.

Amateurism

James R. Spalding (Bellarmine College): I have the full section, all the

proposals on amateurism; and the first four of those are dealing with complimentary admissions. The very first one, Proposal No. 98, is amending the constitution to allow an authorization for each division to set and establish procedures for administration of complimentary admissions and to remove the current restrictions so that each division, therefore, could follow up in determining exactly whether or not they want to use hard tickets or they want to use complimentary pass lists and who are to receive those and under what circumstances.

The one that affects us, if No. 98 is passed would be Part C. Part C allows Division II people to use tickets. It's a complimentary ticket that can be distributed to persons designated by the student-athlete and who then have to identify themselves and who have to sign for those tickets. However, before we will be able to vote on Part C, there is an amendment to that section in the next proposal. And that's Proposal No. 99. No. 99 would simply change the reading of section E so that the student-athletes can receive and distribute without any consideration hard tickets. The institution simply hands student-athletes tickets, and they are able to have complete determination of who and how those tickets are distributed. Proposal No. 100 allows complimentary tickets to be used but brings with it a number of conditions under which it can be received. Proposal No. 101 maintains complimentary admissions but changes the restriction so that no more than one person, other than the family or a relative or a fellow student can receive the ticket.

Proposal No. 102, which is the use of the student-athlete's name and picture, provides an opportunity for the students-athlete's name and picture to be used under certain circumstances. In doing that, however, it asks for a complete repeal of current Case No. 44 and all of the administrative interpretations that have been issued since September in The NCAA News. The Council has discussed this probably at every meeting that we have had in the last year; and we feel that even though there are not too many institutions in Division II that have an opportunity to give out an autographed basketball or autographed team pictures to be used for fund raising purposes, the leaders of Division I particularly have an unusually large number of requests. The Council really opposes removing the current case and the structured interpretations, the very clear method that we currently have in reference to this issue. So the Council would ask that Division II people join with the Division I and others in opposing this piece of legislation.

Proposal No. 103 would allow the institution permission to pay for tryout expenses to the United States Olympics Sports Festival sponsored by the United States Olympics Committee. This is a sports festival that happens every year other than the Olympic year. Currently, legislation allows institutions to pay for the expenses if it's directly to the Olympic trials and in the year of the Olympics. It is not allowed, however, to pay expenses beyond that. I leave it to your judgment as to whether you want to vote for that or not. However, it is an opening for institutions to have to pay for expenses that maybe the USOC ought to be paying themselves.

In Proposal No. 104, many of you have read in the past year the embarrassment of not being able to allow for legitimate expenses of a parent or fellow student-athletes to attend the funeral of a student-athlete member or visit after a possibly life-threatening injury or illness to an athlete. This is permissive legislation. It doesn't have to be done; but if circumstances are

warranted, it will allow the institutions to meet those expenses.

Membership and Classification

Sandra T. Shuler (North Carolina Central University): No. 105 is one that has been highly publicized at this Convention in Division III. I think this is their baby. It's an attempt on their part to eliminate multidivision classification of their members and also to prohibit Divisions I and II from classifying their football programs in Division III. The effective date for No. 105 is 1991. No. 106 is very similar, except that the effective date is 1987. Again, it's an attempt to prohibit the Division I and Division II programs from classifying their football programs in Division III and thus enable Division III to reserve its 16 play-off spots for Division III.

No. 107 is proposing that the Council by a two-thirds vote grant exceptions to the four-sport sponsorship requirement if insufficient interest can be demonstrated.

Proposal Nos. 108 and 109 are Division I matters. No. 110—sports sponsorship criteria waiver—is an attempt to ask that the Council be able to grant exceptions to the minimum number of intercollegiate contests or the minimum number of participants in a contest. No. 111 would provide for a year of probation before a school failing to meet the sports sponsorship criteria moves into the "unclassified membership" category.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Track and Field

Mr. Green: No. 112 is one of the proposals upon which we will vote. [Proposal No. 112 (Page A-81) was withdrawn.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Championships

Joan Boand (Grand Valley State College): Proposal No. 114 has been ruled out of order, but there is an amendment to the amendment, No. 114—I, that is in order; and this amendment to the amendment directs the Executive Committee to bring legislation to the 1988 Convention that would prohibit team sanctions for positive drug tests. The council opposed the amendment to the amendment. Proposal No. 115—individual-team championships—would rescind the Executive Committee's action that made all Divisions II and III championships terminal.

Ade L. Sponberg (North Dakota State University): I just want to alert this group that the battle to maintain advancement for Divisions II and III rests on your decision on No. 115. When this organization split into divisions, it was based on the premise that excellent athletes would be able to move up and participate in the ultimate contests in the Division I National Championships. If this is not voted in to rescind the Executive Committee's decision to terminate all championships, we will lose that option. We voted on it in 1976, 1979, and 1983. It was defeated each time.

Ms. Boand: Proposal No. 116 is a Division I proposal only. Proposal No. 117 would reestablish the Division II Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships. Proposal No. 118—championships eligibility—would force Division II members to go to Division I championships rather than Division III for those sports in which Division II does not conduct a championship. The Division II Council members are opposed to this proposal. Proposal No. 119 would be moot if No. 118 passes. No. 119 would prohibit Division II members from competing in Division III championships if there is sufficient numbers for their own championships. The real issue here is the indoor track championship.

Proposal No. 120. This would permit Division II members to declare eligibility for the National Collegiate Championship or the Divisions I or III championships when there are no Division II championships at all. This proposal addresses particularly lacrosse and field hockey issues.

Proposal No. 121 would allow Division I or Division II institutions that establish a new football program and to place it in Division III and be eligible for the Division III championship after a two-year period.

Practice and Playing Seasons

Richard B. Yoder (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): I will review with you the playing-and-practice-seasons legislation, starting with Proposal No. 122. It is an Atlantic Coast Conference proposal that applies limits on all sports and establishes the traditional playing season and sports programs. Additionally, Section E, which is moot if No. 128 passes, establishes some sport-contest limitations. It is our understanding that the Presidents Commission has recommended it be withdrawn. We don't know whether it will be withdrawn.

Proposal No. 123 is a Council-supported, subcommittee-on-playing-seasons proposal that would allow institutions to take advantage of the sport exceptions to the maximum number of permissible contests in Bylaws 3-2 and 3-3. However, applying these exceptions can only be taken advantage of once every four years, rather than the present rule that allows these exceptions every year.

Ronald J. Petro (University of Alaska, Anchorage): There are so many amendments to the amendment for No. 123; and it is getting very confusing concerning the exceptions, especially for Alaska. We have difficulty getting enough games sometimes to reach the NCAA 18-game women's basketball minimum. And what this is saying for Division II is that now if you come, you can only come once every four years and gain the exception.

In some cases, it's difficult for us to get games. There may be a team on the West Coast that might want to come up once every three years or two years to help us out. I am kind of ambivalent on how to vote on this because it gets so confusing. I know it hurts the Great Alaska Shootout, but none of the teams in Division II go to the Great Alaska Shootout. So, that is not appropriate for this forum. Then we get involved with the Hall of Fame Classic. As far as Division II is concerned, this would mean if it was voted in that those games would not be exempted except once every four years. The good thing about this, if you came to Alaska and we pay your way whenever you come, is that you would be able to play Fairbanks two games and Anchorage two games and not have them count. That is a change, which is a positive change for us.

But the whole thing that I believe is negative is that it's once in every four years. At this point, I would urge that until it's clarified, it go back to the committee. That committee had no input from Alaska or Hawaii, and this came out very late. My suggestion is to get it back to that committee and redefine it for the next convention.

Mr. Yoder: Proposal No. 124 is a Council-supported proposal that requires the competition to be against active NCAA members in order to take advantage of the exemption of counting the contest against the maxi-

imum number of contest limitation. The key there is active NCAA members. Proposal No. 125 is a Council-supported amendment that permits two conferences in the country, the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and the Pennsylvania Athletic Conference, to play a championship football game. Passing No. 125 cleans up a proposal that was passed overwhelmingly last year but later was ruled insufficient to accomplish the intent. This proposal now has both the Council support and the blessing of the Postseason Football Committee.

Proposal No. 126 establishes a limit of 10 basketball games on a foreign tour going into the summer, between terms or during vacation periods. Presently, teams can play 20. Proposal No. 127 is a Council-opposed proposal that permits practice sessions in women's basketball between a coach and a student-athlete for the entire academic year. It's my understanding that this proposal will be withdrawn. Also, it is opposed by the Presidents Commission. Proposal Nos. 128, 129 and 130 are Division I-only proposals and are opposed by the Presidents Commission. Proposal Nos. 132, 133 and 134 are all Division III issues.

P. Laverne Sweat (Hampton University): I would just like to go back to Proposal No. 117. I would like to get some feeling from this body in terms of whether or not we want to have the Division II Indoor Track Championships reestablished. In 1984, we as a division, voted for the track championships to be held in 1985. We came back to the 1985 Convention, and we as a division voted that championship out before we could even hold the first championships. Because the host institution had already planned for that championships, we were allowed to have it in 1985. Because this body then voted it out, we did not have it in 1986. Now, the track coaches are asking that this be reconsidered. I know that it's going to take a two-thirds vote of the entire Convention in order to put in a new championships. But because we did it to ourselves, I would like to know how we feel about this championships. I am the one who gets up on the floor every year to try and get this championships established; and if we don't want it again, I am not going to get up here and do this.

Mr. Green: I should point out that at a meeting on December 8th, the Executive Committee opposed the adoption of Proposals No. 112 and 117. The committee asked that the Convention be advised that if the championships were reestablished, transportation expenses would not be provided by the Division II block-grant fund. That is, as I said, from the minutes of the Executive Committee. I suppose it's about as strong a statement in opposition as it would have been possible for the committee to adopt.

Ms. Sweat: As you note in your convention booklet, there was placed a note indicating the cost of that championships to the Association in 1985. The Division III championships cost the Association \$25,000. I don't understand, with the block grant and the division being able to administer the block grant for its own division, how the Executive Committee can arbitrarily decide that they are not going to fund the transportation.

Mr. Green: Well, the committee's feeling, simply put, was that it did not make a lot of sense to reestablish at a cost of some \$92,000 a championships that really created no new championships opportunity. The same individuals compete in indoor and outdoor track, essentially. In reestablishing the championships, we take out of the relatively limited block-grant funding, which has increased somewhat but still is less than one million and a half

dollars, money that could be better spent in supporting the other championships. There is only a finite number of dollars in a block grant. The committee was saying, in effect, to take \$92,000 of that for an indoor track championships at the expense of the other championships was something it would not approve.

Ms. Sweat: Well, if those of us who were here at the last Convention recall, there was legislation on the floor to eliminate the Division I and also the Division III championships. And those championships were not eliminated. And if we remember correctly, it was when LeRoy Walker came to the microphone and made a plea with reference to Olympic development that those two championships were kept. I do feel that not all Olympic athletes or world university team athletes come out of Division I.

[The straw vote indicated a small majority opposed to the proposal.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Reconsideration of Tryouts

James F. Battle (Virginia Union University): Before we go on, I was on the prevailing side; and I'd like to request a reconsideration of the vote on Proposal No. 92.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Reconsideration of Proposal No. 92 (Page A-68) was defeated by Division II (73-83).]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

General

Howard Elwell (Gannon University): We are now on the general section of proposals; and Nos. 135, 136, 137, and 138 are all Division I proposals that would reduce or otherwise affect coaching staffs. Obviously, they are of no interest to us here at this meeting. No. 139, if adopted, would permit the Executive Committee to authorize the executive director to act on routine requests and recommendations when they are routine and not controversial and there is no question of their interpretation or application of such things as use of member institutions facilities for various activities, involvement of institutional staff and various approved activities. These things are received and approved every day; they are routine in nature. Actually, this is done with approval of the Administrative Committee; and this would permit this practice to continue.

No. 140 has to do with infractions appeals. Currently in any infraction cases, the appeals are heard by the entire Council. Passage of No. 140 would establish subcommittees of the Council to hear appeals on a federated basis. In other words, you would appeal only to a subcommittee made up of individuals from member institutions within your own division. Of course, the implication here is that you would, I guess, receive a better shake from your peers, who may be or are more familiar with the situation in your own division and not have it decided by Division I people and/or Division III people.

No. 141 is also related to appeals. It specifies that an institution has a reasonable amount of time to make its oral presentations on infractions appeals, rather than the specified 15 minutes. All too often, these appeals people travel with the student-athlete involved, a couple of attorneys, the athletic director, the college president; and sometimes it's very difficult to

hear them all in the 15-minute time period. The chair of the particular subcommittee would determine what represents a reasonable time for the people to make their appeal.

The Council is opposed to No. 142 referring to interpretations. This would prohibit action or penalties being taken or imposed upon an institution that is in violation of an interpretation that contradicts or conflicts with other NCAA legislation that's published in the Manual. If the violation occurred after the publication of the Manual but prior to the publication of the Manual that contained that particular interpretation, then the implication here is you could not be penalized for something that is not in the Manual. As you know, interpretations go on each and every day; and if this proposal were passed, it would invite public interpretation of the Manual, rather than by the staff who makes the interpretations that are later approved by the Council. I thought I could explain to you what Paragraph No. 3 of that particular proposal meant, but I really can't because I don't know. But I think what it says is that if there is an interpretation published and it adversely affects one-third of the membership, and within 60 days that one-third of the membership files a written objection, then violation of an interpretation could not be imposed. This proposal would undermine the current interpretation process, and we urge you to vote against this particular proposal.

No. 143 is going to be withdrawn.

Finally, 144 deals with ticket distribution for postseason football contests. If you are a participating institution, you would have up to 48 hours to request the number of tickets you want, up to one-sixth of the total seats available in the stadium. After receiving your allotment, you may return only a maximum of 1,000, as long as you do that prior to 10 days before the game. Otherwise, you would be responsible for the total amount that you received.

Eligibility

Raymond M. Burse (Kentucky State University): No. 145 has to do with the five-year rule and would eliminate the hardship exemption and allow a five-year period of eligibility. No. 146 is an attempt at a modification of the hardship rule and states that if an injury or accident takes place in the traditional playing season, the opportunity for an additional year of eligibility would be possible.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): Mr. Chair, could I ask if it's possible to find out how this body feels about No. 145. That's a rather interesting proposal that I am sure Division I is going to reject again. But the gentleman who indicated that four additional days of football recruiting during the Convention might help him catch up with Division I, might appreciate this proposal. Five years of eligibility might help them catch up with Division I a little quicker. I am very curious how Division II feels about five years of eligibility.

[A straw vote on Proposal No. 145 indicated opposition from Division II.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Seasons of Competition

Chris Rinne (University of California, Riverside): On behalf of the eight members of the California Collegiate Athletic Association, I would like to

move the adoption of Proposal No. 147.

[The motion was seconded.]

The issue in Proposal No. 147 is one of fairness in athletics competition. Specifically, it relates to the advantage that is gained with age due to physical maturation coupled with the opportunity for continued athletics experiences. Division I recognized this inequity of the 18- to 20-year-old athletes competing against the 25- to 30-year-old internationally seasoned athlete in competition and passed in 1980 Bylaw 5-1-(d)-(3) and has since fine tuned that legislation. In 1980, it was not necessary for Division II to consider this legislation, because there were very few of these athletes competing at Division II institutions. But since that time, significant numbers of these athletes have filtered down to Division II level. Case in point, in the 1985 Division II men's track and field championships, in excess of 35 of the event champions were indeed athletes that would fit into this category. Bylaw 5-1-(d)-(3) does not discriminate against the older athlete. It only prevents double dipping in the well of athletics opportunity after the 20th birthday.

The provisions of 5-1-(d)-(3) pertain only to athletes prior to their enrollment at an NCAA institution and after their 20th birthday. The provisions provide that such athletes, after the 20th birthday and prior to enrollment in an NCAA institution, loses one year of athletics eligibility for each year in which they participate in organized competition. Time spent in the U.S. Armed Services is excluded from the provisions of this bylaw. I submit for your consideration the fairness of competition between an 18-year-old graduate of Pumpkin Center High School, and a 26-year-old seasoned veteran of two foreign Olympic teams.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): Can I ask you a question on this? I think I understand the description of athletics competition. This would include the student, for instance, who goes to junior college for two years, does not participate, leaves junior college and goes to work for the construction firm in town for four years. He plays city-league basketball or local amateur soccer for four years. That 24-year-old student is then ineligible for competition at a member institution permanently; is that correct?

Mr. Green: Only in the sport in which he participated.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): To pick up on what the last gentleman said. What concerns me about this proposal is that it smells to some extent of the old five-year rule where a young man or woman comes to your school and spends a year and runs out of funds, goes to work and is a basketball player and plays in a city league because he or she loves to do that. In two or three or four years, he or she generates enough income to come back to school and is not eligible. That's the old five year rule. At the same time, I have a concern for what the other gentleman said; and I think he's talking about track primarily, but not exclusively, where we do have track competitors, especially in the distance events, from all parts of the world dominating NCAA competition. I am sensitive to that. But I am afraid we would be throwing out the baby with the bath water if we passed No. 147 because of the penalties for the legitimate students who have to drop out of school, who do play in some sandlot leagues and lose their eligibility by the time they are 24.

Steve Morgan (NCAA): Some of you may have noticed the difference between his situation and the one that Mr. Barkey suggested. If you are

ever enrolled at an NCAA member institution and then drop out, this rule would not apply. You wouldn't use up your eligibility while you were out of school. It would only be if the only previous collegiate enrollment you had was in a nonmember institution. So it really doesn't impact as directly on the Division II type of five-year rule—a 10-semester rule—as it might seem. It would only be for the student whose initial enrollment was in a nonmember institution.

[Proposal No. 147 (Page A-107) was defeated by Division II.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Eligibility

Mr. Burse: Proposal No. 148 is a proposal that basically is a reaffirmation of what is the current understanding, that the summer term may not be used to satisfy a term of residence for eligibility purposes. Proposal No. 149 is a transfer rule that would allow an individual who transfers from a four-year or two-year institution to one of our member institutions to be immediately eligible for participation in intercollegiate athletics at the subvarsity level.

Proposal No. 150, also a transfer rule, would allow a student transferring from an institution, which dropped the student's sport or this particular student did not participate in the sport at that four-year institution, to become immediately eligible upon transfer. Proposal No. 151 is an attempt to provide an exception to the normal transfer of residence requirement for a walk-on, nonrecruited athlete to become eligible at a Division I or Division II institution as is currently done at Division III schools.

Proposal No. 152 is an attempt, once again, to get rid of 5-1-(m)-(14); and you all know where you can send that proposal.

Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): I'd like to draw the attention of the Division II group to Proposal No. 153, which is on the amendment sheet. It's the last item, actually. I think it's very significant to our division. This resolution is predicated on the idea that Proposal Nos. 105 and 118 will be passed by the Convention. If that occurs, and particularly Proposal No. 118, which would remove the option of Division II institutions moving to Division III in sports where there is no Division II championship, I just want to ask the Executive Committee to prepare legislation and bring it back to the Convention that would provide championship opportunities in every division.

It seems that the extension of the philosophy of Nos. 105 and 118 should be that if everyone is back in their own membership division, then there should be championships in every one of those divisions for the sports that we sponsor. And this has particular impact on Division II, since we don't have championships in indoor track and field, field hockey, gymnastics, ice hockey, soccer, you name it.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Block-Grant Funding

Mr. Green: We have no requests for waivers of Division II membership criteria. We were scheduled to have Connie Claussen, who is one of our representatives on the Executive Committee and chair of the Division II Championships Committee to make a report on the status of the block-grant funding. Now, I am giving this report for Connie. I think all of you are

familiar with the basic policy that we fund 100 percent of the transportation expenses for the team championships and 50 percent of the team-individual championships. We established a five percent contingency fund, which we estimate will run at about \$70,000. The earned per diem will, of course, continue to be paid by the events that generate sufficient revenue to provide per diem under the long-standing formula. The transportation expenses for Division II athletes in the Division III indoor track championships should be paid by the institutions rather than by the Division II block grant.

There are some other minor things, but the principal thing is that we will pay 100 percent of the transportation expense for the team championships and 50 percent for the team-individual championships.

Perhaps the thing that will interest you most is that you will recall that we started out in 1986-87 with a block grant of \$1 million. Subsequently, at the August meeting of the Executive Committee, the Association reported the availability of surplus funds; and the Executive Committee voted to commit \$389,000 of that surplus to the Division II block-grant fund. Subsequently, at the October meeting, an additional \$100,000 in surplus became available and was allocated to the Division II block grant. Similar amounts were allocated to the Division III block-grant fund. This gave us an additional total of \$489,000.

The Division II Championships Committee allocated \$250,000 to the 1986-87 block grant and \$250,000 to the 1987-88 block-grant fund. We thought it would be a mistake to commit the whole half million to this year and get our level of funding up significantly higher, because there is no guarantee that that surplus is going to be there next year. In effect, we ought to take the increased funds available and spread them out over two years; so that if circumstances change, we won't have as far to fall.

[Note: The slate for Division II representatives to the Council and for the Division II vice-president was presented. The slate was approved.]

[The Division II business session was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.]

DIVISION III BUSINESS SESSION

Thursday Morning, January 8, 1987

The meeting was called to order at 8 a.m. by Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego, chair.

ACCEPTANCE OF REPORTS

Presidents Commission

James J. Whalen (Ithaca College): I have been asked to say a word or two about the Presidents Commission this morning. Some years ago when the Commission was first formed, after the first meeting, I was flying home; and I was dictating some letters to John Ryan and some others who were on the Commission. I noted that the person sitting next to me seemed to be listening and looking at my papers, so I began to hold them a little more closely and he kept leaning over and listening. So, finally, I looked at him and I said, "May I help you?" He said, "Well, I have been trying to find out what you are doing." He said, "Are you a member of the Magic 44?" I said, "The Magic 44?" He said, "Yes, that new Commission that has been formed of college and university presidents to clean up athletics." I said, "Well, I'm a member. I don't think it's a Magic 44." He said, "Well, I'm from CBS," and he said, "We have been trying to work out an arrangement for college football and we were meeting in the same building and we have been listening to what you had to say." So, I thought it was very interesting CBS was working already before Dan Rather got there yesterday. Today, I think the magic probably is gone from the eyes of the little man on the airplane. I don't think there ever was any magic.

For those of you who are not familiar with the Commission, it was established in 1984. The desire was to have more involvement on the part of the chief executive officers of member institutions. I won't go into the political problems that existed at that time; but finally, the Commission was established with these ideas in mind: To review the NCAA activities, to commission studies, to sponsor legislation, to establish an order of business, to require roll-call votes and to call special Conventions. It was not to be the conscience of the NCAA; we are the conscience, all of us, of the NCAA. It was to be a vehicle for enhancing information and procedure. We didn't want to be involved in crisis management; it was not to be an ash barrel for every problem that somebody had. That wasn't the role of the Commission. We have tried each year to set an agenda on major issues and keep them major issues and principles. We do operate much like the NCAA, itself. It is a federated presentation with Divisions I, II and III acting separately on issues that are of importance to them; and then we come back together and review what each of the divisions has discussed and/or passed.

I think I might just take a second or two and point out that I think there have been some accomplishments. I have been concerned about the fact that a lot of people have been saying, "Well, the Commission hasn't done anything; and we really need to have an outside Commission appointed." I don't think that's necessary. There have been major studies conducted of the chief executive officers on the important issues for all divisions. We had about a 60 percent plus response on those. I think that was very encouraging. On the basis of that, we had a special Convention where we had, I

think, more than 270 presidents or special representatives present. The Bylaw 5-1-(j) legislation that you will remember was very important to us was passed; and then we had, of course, the problem with the indexing. I think we came to a reasonable solution, which I think was well handled by the Presidents Commission in moderating a final solution. We voted on the related revenues for athletic programs being part of the normal university funds and audited according to university procedures. There was a push for satisfactory progress legislation in Division I. The enforcement and compliance procedures and the difference between major and minor violations was established. We had the students sign off responsibility, and we had specific regulations associated with coaches. There was further refinement during 1985-86 on enforcement procedures. One of those had to do with a death penalty in which if you have two major violations in five years, you could lose one of your programs. Financial aid being moved to the bylaws in the constitution is a very important issue that has been reviewed very carefully by the Commission.

We had done some further work on compliance, and we are now looking at some very important issues that probably are best described in the presentation that you received as you came in this morning on the NCAA Presidents Commission Ad Hoc Committee on Institutional Responsibilities. Let me say a word about that. It was established in October. The American Council on Education had established a subcommittee to look at some of the problems facing intercollegiate athletics. This group met with the Presidents Commission. They outlined a number of issues that they thought should be reviewed. John Slaughter, the Commission chair, appointed a committee, mostly Division I presidents, because that's where the issues really were located; but Jim Cleary of Division II and I have participated in that cost containment committee.

This particular group has been established to set up some general principles to move from the general to the specific and by April to have some saleable packages for a special Convention. The Presidents Commission is recommending one for June 29th and 30th in Dallas. At that time, a number of presentations will be made; and I think it probably will be the most important meeting of the NCAA, perhaps, in its history. That may sound a little bit theatric but let me explain. If we are not able to resolve the problems that are facing us now, we, as the NCAA, and certainly the Presidents Commission, is not going to get another opportunity. There are many people who are suspect of the ability of the Presidents Commission to recommend to the body and to get certain things accomplished; and I think that if they aren't accomplished in this next period of time, then the public will very clearly feel that we are not able to put our own house in order.

You remember the Congressional move to have a committee that was going to look at athletics and that was finally defeated with a lot of effort. That will, I think, rear its head again if we don't show that we are able to do some of the things that all of us feel are necessary to be done. Let me say, it's very difficult to make haste with prudence. Going slowly and not making headlines is very difficult. There are no simplistic solutions as you see on the evening news. These are complex issues, as you well know. Let me just say something now about Division III. We are the largest division in terms of members. I think we can play a very important role in all of what is going to transpire in the next couple of years. I am very concerned about higher

education support in general, and I think there is a parallel with intercollegiate athletics. There is a feeling in the country that, perhaps, the student aid programs are too heavy, that those who are going to profit should pay. There are some simplistic notions about how that can take place; and it doesn't bode well, I think, for American higher education.

At the same time, and I may be wrong on this, I see some parallels here with intercollegiate athletics. How did the drugs get tied up to the athlete? If there is anything that bothers me a lot, it's that when we talk about drugs, athletes seem to be immediately associated with that; and I think that is a big problem that we have. We do have some abuses in some places; we know that. The Convention is going to try to resolve some of those, I hope, maybe once and for all—"for all" meaning for maybe the next 10 or 20 years. I think you know and I know what the value is of what we are doing. I'm not sure that the public understands the value of that. When you see athletes, student-athletes, performing and doing well, I think you and I are fulfilled; but I don't know that that has been communicated as well as it should be in this country. We will have to work on that a little bit more.

Let me say, finally, that the NCAA is not an enemy. The NCAA is us. So, if there is an enemy, like Pogo said, "It is us." I think that's something that has to be constantly reviewed and pointed out. We are the NCAA, coaches and faculty representatives, athletics directors and presidents, all of us; and it's not some little group in Kansas City that is making up special rules and handing them out to all the schools across the country. That's not the way it works. We make up the rules, and Kansas City enforces those rules. I hope that if you have issues that you think are important for the Presidents Commission, Division III, that you will feel free to call or write to me. I will be chair for one more year. This time next year I will be stepping down. I would like to do a good job, and one way is to have good communication. If there is any way in which I can do a better job, I would like to.

Executive Committee

Royce N. Flippin Jr. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): First, some Executive Committee background might be helpful. The Executive Committee meets three times a year—May, August and December—plus conference calls. This year we had one. The structure of the Executive Committee is 14 members, at least three of whom will be women, and it includes the president and the secretary-treasurer of the NCAA, the three division vice-presidents and nine others selected by the Council, of which seven are Division I, one is Division II and one is Division III. The responsibilities of the Executive Committee include the transacting of the business and the administrative affairs of the NCAA; the adopting of the NCAA budgets and management of the NCAA income, expenditures and audits of the budget; to conduct NCAA championships and tournaments, and to employ and supervise the NCAA executive director. The actual procedure of employment of the executive director is with the approval of the NCAA Council and the Presidents Commission and that is formalized in Proposal No. 59 of this year's proposals.

As I think you know, there currently is a search in process to select Walter Byer's successor. I am the Division III representative on that six-person search committee, which includes five members of the Executive Committee and one member of the Presidents Commission. The chair is NCAA secretary-treasurer, Wilford S. Bailey. I think most of you have seen the ads.

You know the applications close January 20th. The charge of our six-person committee is to send an alphabetical list of four to six finalists to the full Executive Committee, and that list should be ready by mid April. After receiving the list, the full Executive Committee will seek the advice and consent of the NCAA Council, the Presidents Commission and the NCAA staff department heads. Finally, on that search, every effort will continue to be made to maintain confidentiality.

Important issues of the Executive Committee of the last year and actions taken include, first, drug-testing. The Executive Committee received and approved with strong support the NCAA drug-testing program protocol at championships as currently in effect. That protocol includes testing procedures; a list of banned substances; the suggested guidelines for self-testing for those institutions that wish to test; the recommended wording for public statements that pertain to eligibility resulting from testing, and finally, the budget allocations for that drug-testing program, which includes \$2 million for the nonprofit independent drug-testing laboratory creation, \$750,000 for drug-testing expenses and \$335,000 for drug-testing education. As you know, I think, sanctions against teams has been a major issue covered in Proposal No. 114 on this year's agenda. The Executive Committee first suspended team sanctions back in May for the fall 1986 championships. In December, this suspension was extended to September 1st, 1987, which is through the winter and spring 1987 championships. Proposal No. 114 puts the issue to the membership.

The Executive Committee approved the fiscal year September 1, 1986, to August 31, 1987, expense budget, which is \$57.4 million. That's the current year. This is up 16 percent from the 1985-86 budget of \$49.4 million, and it's up 26 percent from the 1985-86 actual expenditures of \$45.6 million. This leaves a surplus below budget of \$3.8 million dollars, which helps provide a very favorable picture for 1985-86, including excess receipts of \$5.8 million. These excess receipts have two favorable impacts on Division III. One, the 1985-86 per diem was increased to some six percent of the Division III NCAA membership. I believe those checks have already been sent. And No. 2, the 1986-87 block grants for Division III championship transportation expenses have been affected favorably.

Of course, the block grant is our third issue that we have been dealing with. The 1986-87 Division III championships transportation expense level was estimated to be \$1,661,000 at the beginning of the year, that is for the current year's championship transportation expenses. Our original block-grant budget, you may recall, was \$1.1 million, a short-fall of \$561,000. That gap has been wrestled with by the Division III Championships Committee and by the Executive Committee and was closed by the current Division III block-grant-funding plan. Since the plan was put into effect, the excess receipts have increased the original \$1,100,000 to \$1,450,000 for this current year and \$1,400,000 for 1987-88. Now, this figure could go higher for block grants, because we do have a new CBS TV basketball contract, which is up over 70 percent from the previous year and which goes from 1988 to 1990. So there may be a Division III block-grant break-even or possibly even a surplus for 1986-87. We will take a wait-and-see posture on how the expenses come out for this year in the championships. The result will be watched closely by us. There could be upward adjustments in travel squad sizes if there is some light at the end of the expense tunnel. The par-

ticipation fees could be lowered, depending upon how the excess receipts work out for our block grants. There is a great potential for reductions in transportation costs, to reduce the estimated \$1,661,000. For this reduction to happen, it would require a real commitment and understanding by Division II and Division III institutions to cooperate with Fugazy International Travel. To emphasize, we hope in the future in working with Fugazy to seek the lowest possible air fare costs rather than what has been stressed in the past as the most convenient flight plan. It requires, obviously, on the part of the membership more flexibility in times of departure, avoidance of last-minute changes, use of major airports versus more convenient satellites, acceptance of connecting flights and layovers versus the higher price of nonstop accommodations, etc. We urge all Division III institutions to keep an open and positive attitude on this issue of travel costs through Fugazy International. On balance, the Division III block-grant championship-funding plan is reasonably healthy with good prospects for remaining so.

And, finally, the issue of advancement of Division II and Division III qualifiers to Division I championships certainly is one that has been discussed quite a bit here at this Convention. The principle is covered by Executive Regulation 1-3-(d). Just to review very briefly, advancement now takes place for Division III and Division II to Division I championships in men's golf, men's and women's swimming, men's and women's tennis, men's and women's track and field, and wrestling. In June and July of 1986, the Executive Committee surveyed all NCAA member institutions, athletics directors and members of the NCAA sports committees. Seventy-four percent of the athletics directors and 65 percent of the sports committee members responded. The results were that in Division I, 61 percent opposed advancement of Division III and Division II, which, of course, also means that 39 percent supported, still supported, that advancement. In Division II and Division III, 67 percent supported advancement, which, again, means that 33 percent of Division II and Division III opposed.

Among all athletics directors, 56 percent were in favor of retaining advancement, that is retaining Executive Regulation 1-3-(d) and 41 percent were in favor of limiting the advancement opportunity. So, given these results at the August meeting of the Executive Committee, Divisions II and III recommended no action and recommended referring this issue of advancement to the entire membership for discussion. The Division I majority members of the Executive Committee voted to eliminate Bylaw 1-3-(d) for those student-athletes first entering in Division II or Division III institutions after August 1, 1987. Part of that vote was the agreement to bring the voting action to the 1987 Convention. This opportunity for full membership discussion will happen when you vote on Proposal No. 115. We urge all Division III institutions to vote their wishes. This is the time and the forum. Keep in mind that a yes vote for No. 115 reestablishes Executive Regulation 1-3-(d) and rescinds what is now on the books.

Division III Steering Committee

Ms. Sweet: At this time I would like to share with you some information on the role of the Division III Steering Committee and some of the actions that have taken place during the course of this year. I would refer you to The NCAA News after every Council meeting in order to get the most current information on the discussions and action items taken by both the Council and the Division III Steering Committee. If you read the News

after the Council meetings and if there are any items that appear in the News that you would like to pursue further or you have any questions about, please contact either your district representative or feel free to contact me so that we can find out if we are on the right track, if we need to rethink some of the issues. We try to deal with legislation immediately following this Convention in determining what adjustments we need to make to best represent the will of the Division III membership over the course of the year. We meet again in April, with an attempt to start formulating legislation; we meet again in August to start refining legislation. We meet in October to finalize legislation. Unless we hear from you, we operate on the assumption that what we are doing is what you want us to do; and that's not to suggest that we only want to hear from you if we are not going in the right direction. We would like to hear from you if we are going in the right direction to confirm or reaffirm that that is appropriate action for Division III. So, please contact us and let us know what your thoughts are.

Some of the items that we have dealt with this year include the concept for block-grant funding. We have been in communication with sports committees for their reactions to how we can stretch \$1.1 million to cover anticipated expenses of \$1.66 million. We have followed up on some of the legislation from the 1986 Convention to assure that the interests of Division III are provided for. One example of this was to assure that the Division III Women's Lacrosse and Soccer Championships were allowed to continue. I would call to your attention Proposal No. 42, which unfortunately is going to be ruled out of order in that after the legislation was drafted and finalized, it was determined that it is in conflict with constitutional provisions. The positive thing is that we have been able to convince the Administrative Committee, which consists of the five officers of the Association, that this was a commitment made at last year's Convention to work up legislation that would allow for these two championships to continue. Consequently, if that legislation is going to be ruled out of order, there needs to be a vehicle to allow the championships to continue while new legislation is drafted for the 1988 convention; and that has been supported by the Administrative Committee. So women's soccer and women's lacrosse will continue while new legislation is drafted.

We have tried to assist member institutions in formulating legislation addressing Division III concerns. Some of these will be voted on by the membership. These include the academic honor awards, complimentary admissions, contest limits, and the financial audit and how it fits into Division III. We have reviewed interpretations. These include financial aid clarification. On the tables, there are sheets that reflect the steering committee's attempt to clarify, based on what we have heard from you, what Division III financial aid should be. There are scheduled for this afternoon two round tables dealing specifically with financial aid. We hope that you can give us some input during those round tables in regards to the new interpretations that have been approved by the Council.

We review all proposed legislation, not just Division III legislation; and that goes on from the end of this Convention until the beginning of the next Convention. Sometimes we feel legislated out. We hope that that allows us to pick up on those matters that will have impact on Division III and make sure that the voice of Division III is heard.

Members of the committee also serve on subcommittees of the Council.

This past year, two of us had that opportunity. Alvin J. Van Wie, who will be talking to you shortly, served on the financial aid subcommittee; and I served on the playing seasons subcommittee. The vice-president also serves on the Executive Committee and the Administrative Committee, responsibilities which include biweekly conference calls to deal with interpretations and carry out Association business.

I have also had the opportunity as vice-president to serve on the newly formulated Division III Championships Committee. The Championships Committee was faced with the challenge of trying to make the block grant work for this year. As Royce has indicated, the potential for making it work has been increased by supplements to the block-grant subsidy. We are hoping that expenses will come in under projections, that the amount of money available will exceed the projections and that we can eventually go back to the situation where we are able to provide for full funding to championships in the manner that we enjoyed it in the past. There is no guarantee that that will happen, but that is the goal of the Division III Championships Committee.

As Royce indicated, we have met with the people from Fugazy Travel to try and enlist their cooperation in making expenses as low as possible and increasing their awareness of some of the concerns of the membership. As a result of our discussions with them, those of you who have enjoyed the opportunity of going to championships should have received with your financial report a survey that gives you an opportunity to respond on the quality of service that you are receiving from Fugazy. These also will be reviewed by the Division III Championships Committee to assure that you are being given the kind of service that we hope you should be getting, and we will be monitoring costs for the use of Fugazy. As you are aware, hopefully, that if you are able to procure reservations on airlines at a cost less than that which Fugazy is able to secure, if you will let them know. They have to match those rates provided that they are not special isolated cases that you can only get for one or two people. They should have an opportunity to match them. On a couple of airlines, they are guaranteed at least a 40 percent discount. So we hope that we are getting the most economical deal possible from Fugazy.

Also, we now have a contract with Greyhound Bus; and I would call to your attention that if you are able to get bus transportation at a lesser rate than what Greyhound is able to provide, that that needs to be approved by the NCAA business office prior to your travel so that we are not paying more than we should be paying for bus transportation. For 1987, the Division III Championships Committee hopes to survey and determine membership attitudes on sports committee responsibilities and championships operations, and the committee hopes to work with sports committees to address these concerns. We have put together a rough draft of some of the concerns that have been called to our attention. What we will attempt to do is verify whether or not these are widespread concerns or whether they are isolated concerns. I would like to share some of them with you right now and encourage you to contact members of the committee or myself if you feel that these need to be pursued further.

The first area has to do with composition of sports committees—The percentages of coaches and administrators, involvement of assistant coaches, combined divisions committees and disregard for divisional advisory com-

mittee recommendations, and self-perpetuation of sports committees regarding appointments. We need to verify whether these are perceived or whether these are real concerns.

The second area has to do with the economy of championships; cost to individual institutions; time away from classes, such as week-long individual team championships and the number of weeks of team championships; concept of regional terminal events in certain sports as opposed to national championships, and advancement to Division I championships.

The third area has to do with quality of championships. Are qualifying standards stringent enough, such as time standards in swimming and track, and is the intent of individual-team championships, such as tennis with both an individual championship and a team championship, being met.

The fourth area has to do with rules changes with financial impact, such as football goal posts being changed and the use of three soccer officials. The fifth area has to do with team rankings—the criteria used, the objectivity, the impact on selection and the confusion generated by coaches polls when there are no NCAA polls. The sixth area has to do with automatic qualifications, whether the lack of consistency from sport-to-sport is a problem or whether it's appropriate, how automatic qualifiers are determined and how they are evaluated for potential renewal.

The seventh area has to do with the selection process. Does everyone have an opportunity to qualify? Is there inconsistency among sports that results in confusion in understanding the selection process? How do strength-of-schedule interpretations fit in, and what do they mean from sport-to-sport. Other areas include the use of power ratings, the impact of contests against Division I and Division II teams, the implication that non-ranked Division III teams must travel large distances to compete against ranked Division III teams in order to have an opportunity to be selected for championships, and the impact of a limited Division III schedule due to geographical restrictions, the impact of Division III institutions refusing to play other Division III teams in order to negatively impact the other institution and increase the first institution's play-off opportunities, selection standards imposed by committees that are not included in the championships handbook, the impact of out-of-season results, and the impact of playing more contests than others and how that potentially affects strength of schedules and selection opportunities. The last area we have is on-site selection criteria.

Financial Aid Subcommittee

Alvin J. Van Wie (College of Wooster): The financial aid subcommittee of the Council was charged with the responsibility of studying the complex problems regarding financial aid. The subcommittee's initial step was to review the concept of removing financial aid from the constitution and placing it in the bylaws. As many of you will remember, this legislation has received majority support in past Conventions but has just missed receiving the two-thirds majority needed for adoption. The result of our deliberation is Proposal No. 44. It is the opinion of the subcommittee that this is a much stronger proposal and deserves the support of the membership.

Allow me to take a few moments and highlight what I consider to be the major points of this proposal. The intent of the legislation is to provide each division with the authority to determine independently its maximum per-

missible amount of financial assistance for an individual student-athlete. In providing that independence, the legislation retains in the constitution an overall maximum limitation on cost of attendance at the institution. This is Part A of the proposal, and I consider this an extremely important part because it designates cost of attendance. Part B retains in the constitution that any assistance above the current limits must be based on determined needs of the athlete. Again, I think that's an extremely important part. It should be understood that cost of attendance is a term used by the Federal Department of Education and the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators. Part C of the proposal sounds complex; but it does not change the current legislation, it merely removes the legislation from the constitution, the maximum amount of financial aid a student can receive, and places these same words in the bylaws.

An important feature of Proposal No. 44 is that it would permit Division I and Division II to tailor their restrictions to more closely approximate the treatment of student-athletes to the regular student body.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): Could you clarify the fact that in the existing rule book on Page 116, Section 1, says, "Division III members shall be exempt from compliance with all provisions of this article"? At the present time, there is nothing in the bylaws that dictates financial aid for Division III. We are putting something in that comes from, what, a different part of the constitution or is this new legislation that reflects the constitution? You say we are moving it from the constitution into the bylaws.

Mr. Van Wie: Right. Part C is exactly the same wording that is in the constitution that we would put into the bylaws. It is exactly the same wording. It appears very complex, and it is complex, believe me, but it is being removed exactly as is. There is actually no change that will take place this year under this legislation.

In regard to actions taken by the Division III Steering Committee with regard to financial aid, the Steering Committee is sponsoring Proposal No. 113 that deals with academic honor awards. The Division III Steering Committee and the Council as a whole have approved two new interpretations regarding financial aid.

Playing Seasons Subcommittee

Ms. Sweet: As a member of the playing seasons subcommittee, I would like to update you on the goals of that group. I am the only Division III member of that committee. There is one Division II member. The majority of the committee consists of Division I; and it is perceived that the biggest problem, the playing seasons and number of contests, is a Division I problem. Based on the discussions that took place yesterday at the Division III forum, I'm not sure that's an accurate statement. I know that there are concerns among the Division III membership on both sides of the coin, that we should have limitations or we shouldn't have limitations.

The subcommittee is currently in the process of surveying all institutions on specified sports. All sports will be covered, and I think that it is probably safe to say that all of you have received at least one or two survey forms that address the number of contests, length of season, number of hours involved for your student-athletes in participation, and the results on or the impact of their participation on their academic progress. Selected student-athletes from all divisions will be contacted for in-depth phone surveys of their reac-

tions for an indication of how much time they feel they devote to their sport and what they feel to be the impact of this amount of time on their academic abilities and their academic commitments. The committee will be meeting again in February to try to make some sense out of the information that we receive and to determine if, in fact, a problem exists or it does not exist but merely is perceived to exist. So we will have more information from you. We will have more information for you. I hope that you will take the time, even though sometimes it seems burdensome to fill out another survey, to give us the facts so that we can accurately analyze what the state of the art might be.

Nominating Committee

[Note: The slate for Division III representatives to the Council was presented. The slate was approved.]

WAIVERS

[Note: The Division III business session heard petitions for waivers of Division III membership criteria from Findlay College, Gordon College and College of Mount St. Vincent. The petitions for waivers from Findlay College and Gordon College were denied. The petition from College of Mount St. Vincent was approved.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Football Recruiting

From the floor: I move the adoption of Proposal No. 78-B.

[The motion was seconded.]

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I rise to speak in opposition to this. Hearing nobody speak in support of it, maybe this is fruitless. There are many Division III institutions that for one reason or another either don't send their coaches to the football coaches meeting or see fit to use their time in other ways during that period, some of which may be involved with school visitations on behalf of their admissions office. I think this legislation is not needed in Division III, and I would urge your defeat of it.

George M. Harmon (Millsaps College): I also rise to speak in opposition. Perhaps it is unnecessary because of the wording being subject to two interpretations, but this proposal still could be misconstrued. It says that there shall be no contacts by any institutional staff member and, then it goes on to say "or representative of an institution's athletics interests." If you separate those two phrases, it could mean that the admissions office could not even make contacts. I know the sponsors have indicated this was not intended, but I'm not sure it couldn't be construed legalistically this way. Rather than risk that, I would vote against it.

[Proposal No. 78-B (Page A-60) was defeated by Division III.]

Self-Financed Visits — Division III

Mary Jean Mulvaney (University of Chicago): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 87.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think the intent of this motion is rather straight-forward. It would allow Division III member institutions to provide housing to a prospective student-athlete during a self-financed campus visit, provided that such housing generally is available from the institution to all visiting prospective

students. It has long been the Division III position that student-athletes are an integral part of the student body and should be treated as all other students. This legislation, I believe, serves to address a situation in which student-athletes have, indeed, been treated unequally to their disadvantage by our institutions.

[Proposal No. 87 (Page A-64) was approved by Division III.]

Academic Honor Awards

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 113.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to allow student-athletes with at least a 3.500 high school grade-point average, an ACT score of 24 or a SAT score of 1,050 to qualify for the academic honor awards regardless of whether the student was in the upper 20 percent of the high school graduating class. What we have found is that there are quite a few very highly competitive high schools and prep schools in major metropolitan areas where the entire graduating class is very highly qualified and highly motivated and will be moving on into the collegiate area; and because it is a very highly competitive school, there are youngsters who did not fall in the upper 20 percent, despite having college board scores of 1,200, 1,250 and 1,300. They were below the top 20 percent and, therefore, technically ineligible for academic honor awards. We hope that legislation like this will allow those students that are truly outstanding to be considered for academic honor awards.

[Proposal No. 113 (Page A-81) was approved by Division III.]

Limitations on Numbers of Contests

Russell J. Poel (North Central College): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 132.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this, as stated, is to exempt contests or dates of competition in Division III under the same conditions that currently are prescribed in the regulations for Divisions I and II. Division III philosophically always has stood for the best combination of student and athlete. This division has been careful to avoid excessive scheduling and extravagant claims on the time of these student-athletes. Even given our natural reluctance to extend the seasons, it appears reasonable to exclude the contest of one tournament from the maximum number allowable in the sport as is now currently the case for Divisions I and II. Any other determination does an injustice to the sport and the student-athlete. I would urge your support for Proposal No. 132.

[Proposal No. 132 (Page A-94) was approved by Division III.]

Limitations on Numbers of Contests

Thomas M. Kinder [Bridgewater College (Virginia)]: I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 133.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to reduce from 11 to 10 the permissible number of contests (games or scrimmages) per season in Division III football. Again, it has been the position of Division III, so to speak, that the student in student-athlete receives the emphasis. Elongation of the football season for the play-offs is unnecessary; and since the Division III Football Championship has been expanded to a 16-team tournament, it will be possible for a

team to play as many as 14 games. This is not in the best interest of the student-athlete or the institution; and from a survey taken, it was found that there was substantial presidential support for reducing the season.

Michael Briglia (Glassboro State College): In a discussion yesterday, it came up that surveys were taken and basically there are no Division III institutions participating in 11 regular-season contests. By going down to 10 games or the number of 10 in this particular proposal, it eliminates a scrimmage. Many of us do participate in a preseason scrimmage followed by 10 games with traditional opponents. We are not trying to play 11 actual games, but we do not really appreciate the fact that we would not have the opportunity to have the preseason scrimmage. For this reason, we urge the defeat of this particular proposal. If it is defeated and should future legislation come forth, I think you ought to give the institutions who already have contracts in place more than just one year to get rid of or eliminate the obligation that we have by contract.

Mr. Kinder: There are institutions that do play 11 games in Division III. Also, keep in mind that the effective date is 1988; and if a scrimmage is a problem, amendments can be added next year to take care of this concern. We realize that some institutions do have this problem with scrimmages, and you can amend this since the effective date is 1988.

Ms. Sweet: I also would like to add in regard to the concern on contracts that it is my understanding that anyone who has a contract in place prior to the time that this legislation would be approved can appeal to the Division III Steering Committee to play the number of games based on that contract.

Willie Myers (University of Wisconsin, Whitewater): We are one of the institutions that has contracts for 11 games through 1989. You indicated we can appeal to play those games under contract, but there is no guarantee that that would be granted under this legislation as it is presented.

Ms. Sweet: I think the steering committee is sensitive to that situation and that there would not be any problems in granting a waiver.

F. Paul Bogan (Westfield State College): Can someone tell me why this came up at this time? Because 11 is permissible doesn't mean you have to play 11. I can play eight if I want. I can play nine. I don't understand the numbers game. Why is 11 now of such a concern for Division III?

Mr. Kinder: I think that the steering committee looked at this and felt that the division itself is looking at the possibility of limits in all areas, and football had the possibility of going to 14 games. Now, if a team is in a play-off and plays 14 games, that certainly is not good for the student-athlete. It goes against the division philosophy to increase rather than decrease.

Ms. Sweet: I think there was one other concern, Paul, and that is concern with the expanded championship format combined with the 11 games. That pushes the season back a week further, which interferes with exam periods, with potential vacation periods. This would allow for the season to end the same time that it ended prior to expanding the football championship.

Mr. Bogan: Then maybe we should be discussing why we expanded the football championship.

Ms. Sweet: I think that if you do have concerns about the expansion of the football championship, it would be appropriate to address those concerns to the Division III Football Committee and the Executive Committee.

Ron Labadie (Adrian College): In our football round table meeting the other day, we discussed this at length; and a lot of the coaches were not

aware that the scrimmage situation was involved. A straw vote was taken, and many of the coaches talked to the point that they would rather play nine games and have a scrimmage than play 10 games. Going back to the Division III philosophy, the scrimmage situation allows more kids an opportunity to prove themselves earlier in the year. We would like to defeat this and continue with the scrimmage situation.

Ms. Sweet: The situation that you described as the sentiment of the football coaches — to play nine games and a scrimmage — is certainly permissible under this proposal. The 10-game figure allows for a combination of games and scrimmages.

Jerry Clark (Cornell College): The scrimmages are with schools that are very close. We are in a situation where the schools in our league are not real close, but there are a lot of schools that are not in our league and it allows us to have a scrimmage with those schools. It doesn't cost us a lot of money. It really helps in our situation to allow us to have that preseason scrimmage, and it doesn't take time away from school.

Ms. Sweet: I would just point out the reason that the date is 1988 is to allow the kind of input that you are giving us so that if there is sentiment for approving this proposal, it can be approved now and amended at the next Convention to allow for the 10 games plus a scrimmage. I hope that you won't confuse voting for this as disallowing the opportunity to provide for a scrimmage in the future, if that's the will of the membership.

From the floor: Does a problem exist or do we perceive to have a problem? I have a concern. If we are going to conduct a survey, which you indicated we are, about limiting seasons for other sports, why are we making a decision about football now?

Ms. Sweet: There was a survey done in football that went to chief executive officers; and if I remember the percentage that was quoted yesterday, it was close to 78 percent of the responses indicated that they would like to see a reduction to 10 games in football.

From the floor: I guess I'll get back to my original question. I still would like to see the survey done for football as it is going to be done in other sports. Also, look at the figures. When you talk about 11 games in football, all played on Saturday, football is one of the few sports that does play on Saturday and probably the sport with the fewest number of contests.

Mary Jean Mulvaney (University of Chicago): From the comments I hear, I wonder if it would be appropriate to remand this to the Division III Steering Committee to bring back a proposal next year. I move that Proposal No. 133 be remanded to the Division III Steering Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 133 (Page A-95) was remanded to the Division III Steering Committee.]

Limitations on Numbers of Contests

Thomas M. Kinder (Bridgewater College (Virginia)): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 134.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to limit to 40 in each sport the permissible number of regularly scheduled contests per season in baseball and softball in Division III. Again, presidents indicated that spring sports on many campuses were problems. Limitations of contests should begin, perhaps, with baseball. Let us, in Division III, not require outside forces to dictate reasonable playing-

seasons lengths. Let's recognize what is fitting for our purpose and our institutions. Let's support the limitations set by Proposal No. 134.

William P. Holowaty (Eastern Connecticut State University): I will speak in opposition to this amendment. I think we should refer it to the committee again. I think that for many schools, 40 is not an absurd amount. I'm in favor of restrictions. What I see our Association doing is that Division III is setting an example for Divisions I and II. Why can't Divisions I and II set the example for Division III? I think there are many other sports that are in the same category. I think we should refer this back to the committee and come up with a more reasonable figure for the next Convention. I move that Proposal No. 134 be referred to the Division III Steering Committee.

[The motion to refer was ruled out of order.]

Russell J. Poel (North Central College): I frankly think that 40 is a very reasonable number. I'm not sure how many of our schools have more than 40 games, but I would suggest that it's not very many at all. In terms of using Division I as a model for us, I think that's grossly inappropriate; and I would be very proud to have Division III stand up and be the model for Division I.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I think it's time to adopt this proposal. We have gone down this road of trying to establish limits for all sports year after year after year. Each time we have tried to do a comprehensive package, we get inundated by bits and pieces and selective amendments; and eventually, the whole thing gets washed out. The steering committee put this forward with the idea that we should take a sport or two sports and see if we can deal with them and start something. Possibly over the next six or eight or 10 years, we can bring some sanity and some reasonable guidelines to Division III championships. I think that if this Convention and the membership doesn't address this issue, the Presidential Council will do it for us; and I can assure you that this number is reasonable compared to what you may be faced with if it comes from the presidents. Instead of being 40 for the traditional spring season, it could very well be 40 for the entire academic year. Then you have to pick 10 for the fall, 30 for the spring or 15 and 25. So, this is probably a more liberal piece of legislation than you might get if it comes from the presidents.

Chuck Gordon (Rhodes College): I think you have to be aware that many of us in the sun belt are your hosts for spring trips. We will begin our season in February and end in May. If we are going to be good hosts, as we try to be in the South, and schedule your teams from the snow belt, you are going to find yourselves with about two baseball games a week. I think the result of that would be that it will limit participation, that our top-ranked players will play all of our games and our substitutes will not get an advantage to play some other games. I think 40 is too low.

Donald Harnum (Susquehanna University): We hear this argument often that those warm weather schools in golf, tennis, baseball and softball have longer good-weather seasons than the folks in the North; but I encourage you to consider the fact that their academic year is no different than anyone's in the North. The academic year essentially is the same, and the student-athlete, whether in the north or the south, still has an academic load to carry. One of the arguments against the proposal is that those folks in the South or those folks playing 50 or more games would be playing double-headers on Saturdays and Sundays. Well, should we be tying up a stu-

dent-athlete's time every single weekend with double-headers? When do they have time to study? I would urge adoption of this proposal.

Marjorie Mara (Carleton College): I'm not opposed to the restrictions, but I would urge that we send this back to the steering committee and bring it back next year in terms of number of dates of contests because of the number of problems that we have with softball tournaments and being able to play more than one game in a day and scheduling problems that we have.

Mr. Kinder: This has been back to the committee three times, already. I think it's time we take some action of some sort, either defeat it or pass it, and quit sending all these things back to the committee. Let's have an action.

Michael Briglia (Glassboro State College): I plead guilty, because I have asked for sending back to committees in previous years. Although I personally may never increase my schedule any more than we have had for the last 10 years, I want to caution a couple of things here.

No. 1 we would have to start counting the number of scrimmages that we have, whether they are in uniform or not. Plus, there are people who have indoor batting cages, and many times some pitchers come from other schools to participate against them and that would count. Alumni who come in and throw would count. No. 2, there are a lot of institutions here who only play 25 to 35 ball games. We may now get pressure from the reverse side saying, "Hey, up our schedule to 40."

The point I'm trying to make is that Division I has created a real public relations problem in athletics. All of a sudden, it has flowed down to Division III; and we feel that we need to correct a problem. For right now, I don't think it's appropriate. Most of us are not playing 40 ball games, so why do we need the legislation. There is great sympathy to legislate. I understand that, because there are many institutions that have some problems. By the same token, it can work against us rather than for us.

Ms. Sweet: I would like to clarify what I think I might have heard you say. Bringing in a pitcher or an alumni pitcher to pitch against a player or somebody working out in the batting cage is not a contest.

Thomas Austin (Methodist College): We are one of those schools that schedule in the upper 40's and usually because of inclement weather end up playing below 40, not counting tournament play. So weather must be a factor in scheduling 40 games. There are some schools, I'm sure, that in a 40-game schedule on paper would lose five maybe even 10 ball games to weather. I think that needs to be taken into consideration. Also, our schedule must be approved by our full faculty with a faculty vote. We are limited to the number of classes we may miss for baseball games or for any games that require loss of class time. With this approval by the faculty, we are staying within the guidelines of our faculty and what our institution dictates. If a school wants to play less than 40 ball games, that's their prerogative. If they want to play more than 40 ball games and it is not hurting the educational experience at their institution, then I feel they should be permitted to do so.

Mary Jean Mulvaney (University of Chicago): We have set limitations for football, soccer and basketball, probably much more restrictive than this proposal for baseball and softball. It takes a great deal of time to play a double-header and the student is out of class earlier in the day. Many people do not have lights; and unless you play every contest on the weekends,

which is almost impossible if you are playing over 40 games, the time away from class for baseball and softball players is probably greater than in any other sport. Yet, we have never set a limitation in this particular sport; and I think that this is really the time that we need to move ahead.

Mike Fox (North Carolina Wesleyan College): I have several problems with this proposal. It does not take into consideration the teams, obviously, that are in the warmer climate areas and are able to scrimmage in February, strictly on Saturdays as our program does, against Division I schools that are close. I know this is not advantageous to some schools, but we are able to play eight to 10 scrimmage games against some very good opposition. That significantly helps our recruiting and quality of Division III baseball. We play, also, in the upper 40's in our schedule. We have approximately eight to nine weekends, five days of spring break and two days of Easter, which give us about 25 days to play when our student-athletes are not in class. We played a 48-game schedule last year, and our student-athletes missed five days of class. At the end of the year, our baseball team as well as our softball team, which played 38 games, had a higher grade-point average overall than all of our other student body combined. I think it's important to know that student-athletes can budget their time. If you take your time in scheduling, you can schedule more than 40 games.

I am in favor of limitations. I know that we took a survey of the coaches in the South region, and they were all in favor of limitations. However, they felt 40 was too low; and I strongly oppose the proposal.

Frank Mach (College of St. Thomas (Minnesota)): I want to confirm what I heard on the other side of the room earlier. We come from a conference that, in fact, has limitations more severe than in this proposal; and I will assure you that that limitation soon becomes a standard. If you are now playing fewer than 40 games and you don't have some other restriction such as a conference restriction lower than that, you are going to get the pressure to have 40 games; otherwise, you are not being fair to your coaches, in their estimation. That's the other side of the coin that I think needs to be considered. Then I would like to make a comment. I probably shouldn't but I will. I heard a response, a retort, that this has been back to the committee three times and it's time to move on. If it has been to the committee three times and it's unresolved, perhaps we should reconstitute the committee.

Robert T. Shields (Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison): I think there is an underlying issue here that needs to be considered as part of the reluctance, I think, for us to deal with limitations. It's perceived, perhaps not accurately, that in the selection process for championship play, the number of games played tends to be a factor in the selection process. For instance, if I'm playing 30 games and I have a record of 25-5, and I am competing against another team that has played 48 games and is about 41-7, it is perceived that that team has a better chance at selection. Until we deal with the criteria for selection in terms of numbers of games played, it will always be perceived by coaches that if I only play 35 and that other fellow is playing 45, he has a better chance for selection than I.

[Proposal No. 134 (Page A-96) was approved by Division III.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Ms. Sweet: That completes the Division III legislation. I would like to

share with you some of the proposals that the Division III Steering Committee picked out as possible interest points for further discussion in this business session. The legislation that we defined as of particular interest to Division III are No. 44 on financial aid limits; Nos. 60 and 61 on the financial audit; No. 89 on recruiting material, particularly in regard to our favorite topic of posters; No. 114, the drug-testing resolution that will be ruled out of order and a substitute amendment proposed; Nos. 118 and 119 in regard to Division II institutions participating in Division III championships; No. 121, Division I and Division II institutions participating in the Division III football championship; Nos. 105 and 106, multidivision classifications; Nos. 55 through 58 on the enforcement procedure; No. 115 on advancement in championships, and No. 145 on five years of eligibility. This may not be an all-inclusive list, but we hope that it will be a starting point for any of you that might have particular concerns.

Multidivision Classification

Richard L. Taber (Colorado College): I would like to draw attention to Proposal No. 105, which would cause great hardship for 14 Division III institutions. At yesterday's Division III issues forum, I think it was clearly demonstrated and reinforced again today that there is great diversity among the members of Division III. Now, among these are the 14 Division III institutions that are playing a sport in Division I. In January of 1983, the membership addressed this issue of Division III institutions playing a sport in Division I by amending Bylaw 10-6(a), which severely limits the opportunity for Division III institutions to play in Division I. This, in effect, froze the number of those practicing this. Indeed, the numbers have been decreasing each year from, if I remember correctly, something like 22 in 1983 to 14 today.

Those institutions, Colorado College being one, that addressed this along with the membership in 1983, have proceeded with their Division I programs with a confidence that the NCAA membership had spoken its mind and have developed their plans accordingly. If you examine the sports that are represented in Division I by the 14 institutions, they are largely regional sports or sports where there are very long-standing traditions and rivalries. In our case, ice hockey; in others, tennis, wrestling, lacrosse, field hockey. They are not in what we might call revenue-producing sports such as football and basketball. Tradition is extremely important to these institutions. In our instance, we began playing ice hockey in 1938, were one of the pioneers of intercollegiate ice hockey and in the first 10 NCAA tournaments. Indeed, this represents a great deal of tradition.

It has been alleged that this causes some philosophical problems in that it is an anomaly that some of these institutions do award athletics scholarships in that sport. However, there is no evidence to indicate that this somehow contaminates our Division III programs. Indeed, you may have received a letter from me before Christmas in which I was unable to uncover in men's sports during the last five years any instance in which a Division III multidivisional classified school had won a championship. In Colorado College's case, we have never won a Division III championship.

To summarize our feelings about this, we feel that these 14 institutions that have a Division I sport do not do so for a trivial reason. The reasons are based largely on history and tradition. If we examine the programs, Division III programs at these institutions, we would find that there are no

advantages that are transferred to Division III programs. We do not have large administrative staffs. We do not have expanded facilities. The budgets producing these programs are not increased as a result of Division I participation in any sport.

Financial Audit

Warren C. Bowlus (University of Wisconsin, Stout): The members of the Wisconsin State University Conference and the Wisconsin Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference submitted and support Proposal No. 60. The proposed amendment to the financial audit really eliminates language that requires outside audits but does not eliminate the mandated audit as such. It would continue to allow an outside audit and provide those institutions that so desire to continue along that course of action the opportunity to do so. However, it would provide those schools which contend that the internal audit meets their needs the option to do so, also. In addition, significant financial savings to the already heavily burdened budgets could be realized. Therefore, I ask support of our Division III colleagues in passing Proposal No. 60 when it comes to the floor tomorrow to be voted on by all divisions with a common vote.

Championships Eligibility

Paul R. Dietzel (Samford University): I would like to speak to Proposal No. 121. I would like to quote President Whalen this morning who said that instead of cussing out those people in Kansas City, we should remind ourselves every once in awhile that we are the NCAA. The comment that Division III should pattern itself after Division I, I find rather nonsensical. I think Division III has to have its own philosophy and stick with its philosophy. I have been coming to this NCAA Convention before we even had Walter Byers, which means a long time. I started in this division, I played in this division and then I spent about 30 years in Division I. I'm now at Samford University, which is a very small Baptist school with an extremely modest budget. Samford started up football before I got there, some three years ago, after a 12-year lapse. Now, we couldn't afford to start up a Division I football program so we started a Division III football program three years ago. It has not been tremendously successful, but we are gaining ground. In the first year, we won one game; the second year, we won two and this year, we won three. Who knows, in 10 or 15 years, we are going to be pretty good.

I always have felt that the NCAA, which is us, was supposed to encourage participation. We have legislation now in which we propose that any school which begins football from scratch will never be eligible to participate in the national championship. I'm going to repeat that. If you don't have football and you start up a Division III football program, you will never be eligible to compete in the national championship.

Ms. Sweet: That's if you start football in a division other than Division III. That's not a Division III institution starting football.

Mr. Dietzel: It doesn't make any sense at all that you can start up a football program and never be eligible for a championship; I don't care what division you are in. Now, we do have multidivision memberships. Yesterday, we found out how many divergent opinions we have within this division, and I think we have the same problem in many, many things as we go across divisions. That's one reason why I think multidivision membership

especially for a small school such as we are really makes sense.

Alvin J. Van Wie (College of Wooster): The Division III Steering Committee unanimously opposes 121. It is very clear in reading that "A member of Division I that is classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship except that an institution that had its football program classified in Division III prior to September 1, 1983." If this legislation would pass, we feel this is another opportunity for those schools in Division I that have programs in Division III to enter our championship and dilute the opportunities for Division III schools in the championship. So we oppose it.

Mary Jean Mulvaney (University of Chicago): I think that it's important that this group know what happened in 1983. I think I should preface this by saying that I am from an institution that does not have multidivisional classification. In fact, I philosophically probably felt the strongest about multidivisional classification; and maybe that's the reason I was appointed as a member of the steering committee to meet with the 22 institutions in 1983 when this was a major concern. After hearing their situations and their traditional backgrounds, it was the decision of the Division III Steering Committee at that time to grandfather in, and I emphasize they were grandfathered at that time, the 22 institutions that were playing in Division I at that time. We would not permit any further multidivisional classifications, however, unless the institution chose to go to Division I following all of the rules and regulations of Division III.

At the same time we also grandfathered those institutions playing Division III football in 1983. In that season, we permitted them to play in our championship. We grandfathered in that group, as well; and I believe there were 16 of those institutions. We said at that point that any other Divisions I or II institutions wishing to play Division III football were welcome to play during the regular season, but we would not permit them to play in the Division III championship.

Frank Mach [College of St. Thomas (Minnesota)]: I just want to comment that we are being terribly inconsistent with what we have as a very sound philosophy statement when we propose a position like the one No. 121 has presented. We are really saying that we don't really believe in maximizing participation. We want to do that within certain kinds of limitations. The second thing we are saying, and this really occurred to me more than anything else, is that we really do put postseason competition ahead of in-season competition. A very large part of our disagreement and everything that I have heard in the last few days centers around postseason competition. Yet, in Item 6 of our philosophy statement, we say that postseason competition is secondary to in-season competition. I came from a conference in which we had a Division I hockey-playing school for years, University of Minnesota-Duluth. If it ever dominated any other sport in the years it was in the conference, I failed to notice it. So, I think there are a lot of unfounded fears here.

Four-Sport Sponsorship Requirement

James E. Nelson (Suffolk University): Last evening, I and several of my colleagues had the opportunity to speak with the assembled delegates of the Eastern College Athletic Conference, which is the largest numerical body within the NCAA, concerning the adoption of Proposal No. 107. No. 107 deals with insufficient student interest in bringing forth the mandated

number of athletics opportunities. There was near unanimity for support of this proposal by the ECAC membership, and that body encompassed all three divisions. Those institutions that will be impacted most by this legislation will unquestionably be Division III institutions, and it is hoped that the same unanimity in support for this legislation will be forthcoming from this assembled body.

As was mentioned last evening, it was my understanding that the NCAA Council will oppose Proposal No. 107; and I am at this time not certain of the rationale. I certainly would hope that the thoughts do not fall along the premise of male-female priorities. For those of us affected by what might become the ultimate penalty of a participating member, the deprivation of active NCAA membership classification, the issue is and will continue to be an athletics one. My institution and others will be impacted adversely without the passage of No. 107, because our student bodies have changed over the past decade. Their priorities will not allow them to participate, even though they value intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the collegiate experience. If, in fact, certain members of the Council have persuaded the entire body that passage of this legislation would leave the door open for directors of athletics to curtail a woman's program to the benefit of a men's program, I, as an athletics director, resent this implication. It is hoped that since the advent of Title IX legislation, those directors who previously ascribed to this misguided thinking have either retired, changed their method of thinking or have been replaced. On most occasions when the Council has spoken on an issue, we believe in their omniscience; but on this occasion, they must take into account that the documented waiver, will be from the institution's chief executive officer and that the Council itself still must vote in two-thirds majority for acceptance of the waiver. The empathy and mutual understanding of the unique circumstances that we all face in administering a Division III program necessitates your support of 107.

Lawrence R. Schiner (Jersey City State College): I feel I would like to enforce my colleague's thoughts on Proposal No. 107. Lack of participation in men and women's sports has become a major problem for many NCAA members, especially in Division III urban institutions. I ask Division III as well as Divisions I and II to try to understand the problems with which Division III urban institutions are confronted. Recent changes in the sociological profile of our students has caused a negative impact on some of our athletics programs. Declined enrollment between the 18- and 21-year-old group has necessitated our colleges to enroll more part-time and full-time students and older students with work commitments. In an urban institution, such as Jersey City State College, most of the students that we enroll are from the lower to the lower-middle class of families; and even though they do receive some financial aid, they still must work to support their educational costs and in many cases also must work to support their families. Jersey City State College, like other urban schools, does not have dormitories. Therefore, all of our students are commuters, which puts a tremendous burden upon the participation and transportation problems that are inherent in late practices and away games.

The intent of this proposal is not to diminish the broad-based athletics concept in any way or to cut back monies allocated for the sponsorship of the requisite number of sports. It really is simply a matter of truly insufficient

student interest. A lot of you people do not have this problem and can't realize the impact it has on urban institutions. Right now in the metro New York-New Jersey area, alone, there are eight to 10 schools whose programs are in definite jeopardy if this legislation is not passed. The funds are available, facilities are available to implement the requisite number of sports, it's just the question that we can't get people. For people that are worried about funds being diverted from the men's program to the women's or vice versa, there are two safeguards that are built into the present legislation. The request of a waiver must be sent through the chief executive officer, and his integrity should not be questioned. Number two, the Council has the right to not grant a waiver if they feel it's not legitimate. There are many of us who are struggling with this problem at the present time and whose active membership is in jeopardy. I urge you to strongly support Proposal No. 107 so that our student-athletes will continue to have the same opportunity to participate in NCAA championships as your athletes do.

David M. Weber [Dominican College (California)]: I also would like to speak in favor of No. 107 on behalf of an entirely different type of institution. At Dominican College (California), we have 700 students and roughly 20 percent of them are male. So if there is any fear of funding being diverted from the women's programs, in our case it would be quite the opposite. If a program were canceled for lack of interest it would quite likely be a male program and not a female program.

Sports Sponsorship Criteria Sanction

Dennis Golden (Duquesne University): Duquesne University is a Division I-AAA institution. Prior to joining Duquesne in 1982, I served as the chief student affairs officer and head football coach at Framingham State College in Massachusetts for 13 years. I have a strong commitment to and awareness of the Division III philosophy. In view of this fact, I sought and received permission from Vice-President Sweet to speak to you about Proposal No. 111. I respectfully request your support of No. 111 at the general business session tomorrow; because it is a common bylaw, all divisions divided vote. In this context and in accord with your philosophy, the schools in Division I-AAA also subscribe to the divisional philosophy. We endeavor to abide by the rules and regulations of the Association. We place emphasis on academics. We try to conduct our programs with integrity. We try to achieve a proper balance between athletics and other institutional priorities. In the event, however, that there is a problem either with the number of sports, with the number of contests or the number of participants per contest, the common bylaw, namely Bylaw 10-1-(f)-(3) mandates that the only possible sanction that the NCAA can issue is to place the entire athletics program, both women's and men's, in an unclassified membership category for one year. Therefore, Proposal No. 111 is designed to change that sanction to one of placing the institution on probation for one year rather than automatically decertifying the programs. By adopting No. 111, the Association would do the following: It would provide schools with the proper amount of time to ensure compliance. It would avoid unnecessary hardships and disruptions in both the women's and men's programs. And, finally, a yes vote on No. 111 would relieve the NCAA authorities of the burdensome obligation of imposing an overly severe sanction when the circumstances, obviously, do not warrant it.

[The Division III business session was adjourned at 11:25 a.m.]

DIVISION I BUSINESS SESSION

Thursday Afternoon, January 8, 1987

The Division I business session was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by Lewis A. Cryer, Pacific Coast Athletic Association, chair.

Mr. Cryer: Ladies and gentlemen, it is time to begin the Division I business session. Our procedure calls for us to deal with the legislation proposed, elect our new Council members representing Division I and elect the Division I vice-president. If we have time, we will then discuss other items that you would like to discuss before this group as it applies to legislation.

Reminders for you, that all votes taken in this session are to be indicated by paddle and also we do have two roll-call votes, which require you to have the proper electronic roll-call voting cards in your packets.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Recruiting Contacts

Albert M. Witte (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 47.

[The motion was seconded.]

This has been discussed quite a bit already at the preliminary meetings. To go over maybe some of the same background, we have had this proposal before and it was withdrawn because certain concerns were expressed. We have had a year to respond to those concerns and we think we have. This proposal will be a significant step forward and will eliminate many of the abuses that are attendant upon the recruiting process. We know that some of the concerns deal with the question of whether this is an enforceable piece of legislation. We think it is; because from what we hear from all the coaches, they would like this mechanism to be put in place. They will enforce it because they want to eliminate boosters from the recruiting process, both on and off campus.

Furthermore, we know that there are valid concerns regarding the need to use alumni representatives in the admissions programs that are carried out at many of our institutions. We would hope that the legislative history of this Convention has been to show that we believe that boosters and alumni can be used in any valid admissions policy or program run by the university for all prospective student-athletes. Those of you who are familiar with Case No. 199 will recognize that the principles that are in that case will be adopted by this legislation. We believe the concerns have been answered. I urge its adoption.

John B. Slaughter (University of Maryland, College Park): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, we would urge the support in principle of Proposal No. 47.

Vincent J. Dooley (University of Georgia): I would like to speak briefly in favor of this proposal on behalf of some 44 Division I-A football coaches that met last summer in Dallas and were unanimously in favor of eliminating all athletics representatives from recruiting and keeping recruiting strictly to the staff. We spent a good portion of one day discussing how to go about it and to see if there was some easy way or slow-step way that we could get to that. We finally concluded it had to be the complete elimination, which included telephone calls as well as correspondence. Although

there was considerable discussion that there is nothing wrong with correspondence because one certainly would not put down anything in writing that would ever put one's self in question of violation. Nevertheless, we unanimously were in favor of this proposal; and we think that it would be a great step forward. It would certainly enable us to tell our recruiting interests that they can do absolutely nothing. I don't know that this particular proposal, however, speaks to any contact at the signing; but it was the intention of the recommendation made by the coaches that after the signing period took place, or some period thereafter, that some contact would be allowed in the way of perhaps correspondence. I don't know whether that would be part of the interpretation of this. Suffice it to say, that was the expression of the 44 coaches that were in Dallas.

Mr. Witte: After it is signed, it is the intention of this legislation to permit such contacts.

Michael B. McGee (University of Southern California): We talked about excluding hosts from being representatives, but what about the rest of the team and other members of the student body? I think we need to be a little more specific as to how wide that exclusion is.

Mr. Cryer: Your student-athletes would be all right on campus.

[Proposal No. 47 (Page A-32) was approved by Division I.]

Mr. Cryer: It has been indicated to the chair that No. 54 has been withdrawn.

Academics

Robert R. Snell (Kansas State University): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 62.

[The motion was seconded.]

Following the institution's completion of the academic reporting form, the staff reviewed those forms and then contacted by telephone approximately 100 institutions to discuss the format and scope of the form and the extent to which the information requested was available. The staff review revealed that approximately one-half of the Division I institutions that had completed the form were unable to calculate an exact graduation rate for the student body as specified on the form. This failure currently was the result of the inability to generate for an entire academic class the specific information concerning transfer and students who left the institution in good standing. This proposal would modify that academic reporting requirement to require calculation of the general graduation rate for both entering and recruiting student-athletes. The general graduation rate would be calculated both for recruited student-athletes and the athletes in general as a means of comparing the academic performance for student-athletes within the institution with that of the student body as a whole. The second calculation described in Paragraph No. 5 is really the calculation that would require other factors such as transfers and students that left the institution in good standing would be taken in account. The purpose of this would be to give the chief executive officer more accurate information to assess the progress in athletics programs.

Robert F. Steidel Jr. (University of California, Berkeley): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 62—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is a modest proposal, a civil one, but I think a necessary one. When we read the proposal, there was some doubt in our conference as to whether

anyone who returned for part of the academic year had to be included or not. We felt that anyone who had a problem in a particular conference could have a problem somewhere else. We thought that it would be better editorially to change the word "year" to "term."

[Proposal No. 62 — 1 (Page A-43) was approved by Division I.]

Gwendolyn Norrell (Michigan State University): One of the problems in what was proposed for academic reporting the first time and what is proposed for academic reporting the second time is that the researchers on the NCAA Research Committee were not consulted. Somebody said to me that this proposal moves it from a research design that is poor to one that is horrible. What will happen here is that you will overinflate the graduation rate of athletes throughout this country. I guess I believe in truth in advertising. I ask you to vote down this proposal, to vote for Proposal No. 73, which will give the NCAA Council time to consult with researchers. The institute research people are going to meet in Kansas City, and some of the NCAA research people will meet with them. I think we will have a very good research proposal if you will let the researchers do the work and not people who are not acquainted with research.

[Proposal No. 62 (Page A-42) was approved by Division I (roll-call vote, 202-93).]

Bylaw 5-1-(j) — Eligibility

John O. Bolvin (University of Pittsburgh): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 63.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the 44 or so faculty athletics representatives that met in Dallas last June, I would like to propose Proposal No. 63. Those of you who have worked with "Proposition 48" over the past year realize that it has become a good motivator for our students in high school. We feel that Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(2) as now stated provides a loophole that discourages some students. We believe that with the amendment to this bylaw as suggested in Proposal No. 63, we will improve "Proposition 48." We believe, first of all, that the motivation will be improved because it will not give the loopholes. Secondly, we believe we will close the loophole with people trying to find funds other than institutional funds to help the students who cannot pay their own way. Finally, we feel that this is discriminatory to many students who do not have the money as opposed to the students whose families may have the money. For these reasons, we would ask for your support.

James A. Castaneda (Rice University): I rise also in support of Proposal No. 63. This Association always affirms in word our interests in raising academic standards, but our deeds do not always reflect a committed implementation of the academic ideals we profess. Legislation that effectively raises academic standards historically has had a hard time receiving affirmative votes at our Conventions; and when passed, it frequently becomes eroded as loopholes are exploited and modifications in the direction of leniency are approved on this Convention floor. Proposal No. 63 aspires to the realization of the true goals in "Proposition 48," which has given us Bylaw 5-1-(j). Although the thrust and intent of "Proposition 48" were and should remain academic in nature, its current implementation permits discriminatory treatment of the group of students-athletes whom we classify as nonqualifiers and partial-qualifiers, a discrimination based on athletics rather than academic criteria. If a non- or partial-qualifier is

promising enough, his or her institution will be willing to pay the educational expenses for the freshman year at the cost of a year of eligibility; while other non-qualifiers in effect are permitted to retain four years of eligibility by paying themselves the full educational expenses of their freshman year. The radically different treatment accorded to these two groups, if not for partial-qualifiers, would in itself seem to be an invitation to abuse. In addition, the restrictions on the number of athletes who may be recruited means that for every nonqualifier or partial-qualifier admitted, we are denying the admission to a student-athlete who by our own definition is qualified to participate and compete in intercollegiate athletics. At the same time, he or she has demonstrated the level of academic ability that gives promise of earning a college degree. For many of us, our support of "Proposition 48" was predicated on the belief that student-athletes who have been known to lend deaf ears to the counsel of a parent or teachers would rise to the level of expectations set for them by the athletics establishment. I feel that it is imperative that we demonstrate that we mean what we say when we advocate stronger and more reasonable academic standards. I urge you to cast an affirmative vote for Proposal No. 63 to reaffirm the intentions we announced and the goals to which we aspired when we passed "Proposition 48."

David B. Wagner (Georgia Southern College): I would like to ask a question. If a student-athlete enters a community or junior college, participates as a freshman and a sophomore, and transfers to our institution, we would assume that the student-athlete would then have two more years of eligibility. I ask that question.

Mr. Cryer: We believe the answer is yes.

Mr. Wagner: I would like to speak in opposition to this rule — not that I do not feel this is a loophole that some will take advantage of — but coming from a relatively small regional institution where many of our sports are filled with student-athletes that walk on our campus and many of our sports are not provided grants-in-aid, I feel that these student-athletes — not perhaps the one or two football players, basketball players, but the individuals in all these other sports that come in under these requirements — will lose a year of eligibility. The fact is that the community colleges students could have four years of eligibility, while we are restricting opportunities for some of our individuals that we should care about.

[Proposal No. 63 (Page A-44) was approved by Division I (roll-call vote, 235-68).]

Eligibility — Initial Qualifier

Joan C. Cronan (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 67.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment will allow our student-athletes to have one additional testing made after graduation but before July. It will not allow our athletes to become eligible after July. It loosens the requirements to give one more testing, but tightens them so that a prospective student-athlete would not be eligible after July 1 for the following year.

[Proposal No. 67 (Page A-53) was approved by Division I.]

Initial Qualifier — Outside Participation

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group Presidents): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 68.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 68 would change slightly the interpretation of the Council that would not permit a nonqualifier to engage in club sports activities. I should add that this is not a proposition that involves any of our young men or women to the extent that I know about it. It is just a view on our part that we have to be very careful when we legislate pursuant to the nonqualifier standard. I was informed by a representative of the Council after the amendment deadline that the Council will oppose this proposition on the grounds that it too broadly changes the Council's ruling. The Council's ruling was intended simply to restrict club competition in those sports in which a school offers a varsity sport so that the school cannot provide club participation for a nonqualifier in sports for which that nonqualifier was recruited. We have no problem with that interpretation, but it is not what passed as reported in The NCAA News on October 20th. I understand that there is a representative of the Council who is prepared to speak in opposition to this proposition. If that representative would assure us that that is, in fact, the Council's view and that the Council would look favorably on such a proposal for a case, we would be pleased to withdraw Proposal No. 68.

John E. Thomas (Appalachian State University): The current interpretation of the Bylaw is as follows: A partial-qualifier or nonqualifier would be permitted to participate in the institution's intramural program so long as the intramural program is not coached by a member of the institution's athletics department staff, but it would not be permissible for such an individual to participate during the first year of enrollment in athletics competition on an institutional club team or an outside sports team. The stated intent of Proposal No. 68 is as follows: "To permit partial-qualifiers and nonqualifiers to participate on institutional club teams during the initial year of enrollment at a Division I institution." Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council, I stand to oppose this proposition.

Mr. Orleans: I would simply want to ask whether I correctly understand the Council's view as I expressed it a minute ago, that what it intends by this interpretation is simply not to let a kid play on what looks like a club team but really is a subterfuge varsity team in the sport in which he was recruited. If that is so, we have no problem with that and we will be glad to withdraw this. What we have now is a rule that says that a nonqualifier who is a football player can't go out and play club tennis in the spring, even though that same nonqualifier is singing in the glee club, debating or writing for the newspaper. I frankly don't see what that has to do with the intent of Bylaw 5-1-(j).

Mr. Thomas: In the discussions I heard in the Council, it or the staff people would not want to get into deciding what was a subterfuge team. It simply is a club team.

[Proposal No. 68 (Page A-54) was defeated by Division I.]

Eligibility — Initial Qualifier

John C. Parry (Brown University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 69.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 69 was really designed intentionally for one time for a Brown student who was ineligible due to Brown's negligence. A student was initially recruited by our admissions office, eventually was contacted by our tennis

coach and was admitted by Brown among 2,500 out of 13,000 applications. Afterwards, I learned that 37 of them never took the SAT or ACT tests. However, they all have other credentials, and in our view stronger ones. This man was from England and did very well and gained admission to Oxford. He enrolled in Brown on September 1; and on approximately September 8, I received the secondary school form with no SAT or ACT scores. We declared him ineligible. At that point, we submitted appeals to the NCAA in an attempt to restore his eligibility. We were told there was no basis for the appeal. It was somewhat frustrating. At that point, we were told our only choice was to present legislation. Frankly, we don't want to present legislation to change the intent of 5-1-(j). We didn't want to make any change for foreign students; and therefore, this proposal is really limited to this year only so that in the future everyone else will still have to comply with taking the test. It is very narrow. The young man has taken the test, and I do not know the results yet. For those who are asking, why should we do this, this was really the only alternative left to attempt to regain some eligibility for this young man, assuming that he does score over 700 on the test. In a sense, it is also the only alternative that we can see to the courts. We are given no other choice, and I humbly ask this Convention to support this young man's eligibility.

Frederick Hemke (Northwestern University): On behalf of the Council, I wish to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 69. The Council and the NCAA legislation has consistently supported the taking of the SAT and the ACT tests prior to any and all student-athletes initial, full-time collegiate enrollment. The complex questions of regulating and devising testing requirements for student-athletes that are educated in secondary schools out of the United States require a thorough and detailed study. This proposal deals only with the short term and creates, we believe, an inappropriate, unequal situation. Because of its limited nature and its inherent inconsistency to accepted procedures, the Council opposes Proposal No. 69 and urges you to vote against it.

Mr. Parry: This is the same Council that refused to hear an appeal. Some people in the NCAA suggested this was the only approach. I am not trying to open up Pandora's box. I am trying to solve one kid's problem.

[Proposal No. 69 (Page A-54) was approved by Division I (166-134).]

Satisfactory Progress

Robert A. Stein (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Big Ten Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 70.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 70 should be familiar to many of you. The Big Ten Conference has brought this before the body on some prior occasions; and we have taken considerable comfort and pleasure in the fact that each time we have brought it here, it has received additional support. We believe that this is the year to pass it and to make a powerful statement by our body in support of the academic responsibilities of our student-athletes. As you know, we now have a quantitative academic-progress requirement in terms of accumulation of credits towards a degree. What Proposal No. 70 would do is to establish a qualitative requirement as well. We feel that students who obtain a grade average below that specified in the proposition will have serious difficulty in graduating; and therefore, it is appropriate to have a requirement that will specify grade average being obtained. Basically, Pro-

posal No. 70 would require that a grade average be calculated on a 4.000 scale and would ensure that after the first year the student-athlete has accomplished a grade average of 1.700; after the second year, 1.850, and then after the third and fourth year a grade average of 2.000 in order to be eligible for participation.

These are not unreasonable requirements. We feel that achievement of these requirements is important to ensure that the athlete is making progress toward the obtaining of a degree. We know that some of you may have some concern about the workability of such a proposal because of the various grading systems used in our institutions. I can report that we have used this academic-progress rule in the Big Ten for a number of years. Our institutions have very different grading systems, and it works quite well. It is not difficult at all to use a 4.000 scale to calculate a grade average for athletics participation. You will notice that there is a two-year deferral in the effective date of this proposal so that if there are some situations that need to be addressed, some accommodations that have to be made for various institutions, there will be time to do it. This also provides a period of time for existing athletes to bring their average up to the point that is required. We strongly urge your support for Proposal No. 70. We believe that is one of the strongest statements that we can make in this Convention in favor of the academic responsibility of the student-athlete and the need to make satisfactory progress towards a degree.

Richard D. Mochrie (North Carolina State University): I want to speak in opposition to this. I doubt that any study that the Big Ten undertook would reflect on North Carolina State. Our faculty did look at our students and how they performed, and we do have our own scale. The main point I want to make is that satisfactory-academic progress should be the prerogative of the faculty at the individual institutions, and the NCAA should not infringe on that right of the faculties.

Robert F. Steidel, Jr. (University of California, Berkeley): I rise to speak against this particular proposal. I applaud what the Big Ten does in trying to set a floor under academic standards here, but I don't think that this particular legislation does what it purports to do. Now, I agree with the man from North Carolina State. We do have great grading differences and course differences. I think that is the problem. I think the legislation also has problems in particular with the phrase "have earned." When is a student-athlete considered to "have earned" the required GPA? Is that at the beginning of the term, is it during the term, is it before competition? That is not said. It says before the first season of competition. Does that mean that you do it before the first game, before his or her first game? These are all things that are not worked out yet. If the student's GPA changes during the term, you have a grade change or removal of an incomplete, when does that occur? Can you count an incomplete that changes? I don't think it is any secret that one way to keep a GPA up is to take an incomplete in the course if he or she is going to fail. Then after the date of counting, change it back to whatever it is going to be. You could manipulate these things. I also think, Mr. Chair, and I want to read into the record that 5-1-(j)-(2)-(ii) would mean that only little courses accepted for degree credit can be calculated in the GPA. This brings up the gross inequity in this particular piece of legislation where you have institutions that have physical activity courses that can count towards degree credit. It is up to the university to do that. There

is a decided advantage for those students on campuses where these block courses do not count for credit.

Ronald D. Stephenson (Big Sky Conference): I rise to speak in favor of this proposal. We have had a progress rule that speaks to this in our conference for a number of years, and we have not had the problems that Mr. Steidel spoke of. I think it is a good piece of legislation, and we have had it and we have lived with it for 15 years.

Carl F. Ullrich (United States Military Academy): I would like to speak against this legislation. The one item that has not been spoken to is the courses. I think the differences range from perhaps 12 hours to as many as 22 to 23. That coupled with the course content, it seems to me, makes it a great mistake for us to try and legislate something that indeed should be an institutional decision.

Gwendolyn Norrell (Michigan State University): I think it should be an institutional decision, too; but at most of our campuses, it is much higher than this. If you look at the grade-point average in the proposal here, it is really a very modest grade-point average for most of our institutions. We are for academics.

I think voting for this proposal says that we really mean what we are saying, that we are concerned about the academic side of student-athletes.

David H. Bennett (Syracuse University): The maker of the motion reminds us that this has been before us before, and it has failed before. It may be that it will not succeed until it receives the approval of the Council or more likely the Presidents Commission. I hope that it receives a strong vote today and is brought forcefully to the attention of the Presidents Commission. We talk a great deal about student-athletes; and if we are serious about signalling our student-athletes and the larger public that we are concerned about their academic as well as their athletics success, there is nothing more important that we can do this year than to speak strongly for this motion. In this city, in this room four years ago, Proposal No. 56, which was passed after "Proposition 48," was strong movement towards making satisfactory progress the more meaningful variable in the NCAA and in inter-collegiate athletics. There is still a problem. We used to have the phrase "measuring eligibility." Hopefully, that is no longer possible. But everyone in this room knows that large numbers of students across the country reach their junior and senior years with margins. Weak averages present an obstacle for receiving a baccalaureate degree in some reasonable time that is almost insurmountable. That is what this proposal addresses. It seems to me that if this body and the Presidents Commission are serious about putting the student back in the student-athlete, they will think seriously about voting affirmatively for Proposal No. 70.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I strongly would urge the defeat of this proposal on the basis of academic integrity so that we encourage our athletes to be legitimate students and not majoring in eligibility. We encourage them to work continually toward a degree and not to move over into an area where it is much easier to receive a grade-point average and, therefore, maintain their eligibility, which happens time and time again. I have seen that occur, and I would strongly urge that this proposal be defeated on the basis of academic integrity.

Robert A. Stein (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): Mr. Chair and members of Division I, this proposal is brought forth with the hope and

expectation that it will pass this year. The concerns that were expressed by Mr. Steidel may reflect the concerns others have. If you think the idea is a good one in concept, we strongly urge your support. I can assure you that the problems of when determination is made, how it is made and from what participation can be worked out. The standards that are set forth are minimal standards. If we are serious about the proposition of not bringing students in and exploiting them for a couple of years when there is no possibility of graduating, I think we should support Proposal No. 70 and make a strong statement for academic progress towards a degree.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): I am not sure I know what the right figures are; but from experience, I would tell you folks that if a youngster doesn't have a grade-point average close to what it takes to graduate by the time he has finished his junior year, you can forget about him graduating. At Penn State, we have 1.400, 1.600, 1.800, 2.000. That is not good enough for our football people from practical experience. I have my own eligibility requirements; because I know that if the kid has a 1.600 at the end of the sophomore year, his chances of graduating are not good because he has to have a 2.000 average to be eligible for graduation. The kid is in the engineering curriculum, and he is struggling with a 1.400 or 1.500. He obviously is not good enough to be in engineering, and he should move into something else where he can make progress towards a degree.

We have been carried away with the graduation rates here. I think whether a kid gets a meaningful education is more important. We have a lot of kids that graduate that have not gotten a significant education. I would urge that you would do something in the way of having minimum standards as we go along that would complement the normal progress as to how many credits they take. I don't think it makes any sense to say that a kid has passed 60 credits at the end of two years, or whatever we have right now, and has a 1.500 and thinks he is making normal progress towards a degree. That doesn't make any sense.

Edward T. Foote II (University of Miami (Florida)): I don't want to prolong this discussion, because I think most of the points have been made. I do wish to say that having reviewed all of the proposals that are before you, I believe none is more important than this one to pass. Very few are even in the same category. I had the privilege of presenting Proposal No. 56 to the floor of this Convention, and it was in a slightly different form than what was passed. Those of you who were present will recall that it was in a form that tried without numerical specificity to demonstrate what good academic performance is by saying a student-athlete is not on academic probation. This Convention, in its wisdom, struck the "not on academic probation" phrase and only "academic good standing" survived. I think that was progress. Unfortunately, it allowed enough ambiguity in the interpretation of what is good academic standing that it is virtually meaningless as it has been interpreted in practice. Therefore, although I was in favor of that approach four years ago, I have become persuaded that we must be very, very specific in the way Proposal No. 70 is before us. Even though it doesn't take care of all the difficulties of academic standards, even though it might allow for unfairness for courses that might mean one thing at one university and another thing at another university, it does specifically and clearly on a scale that everyone understands say above this line you may play and below it you may not. I could imagine on top of everything else that this

Convention is trying to do, nothing that will more firmly root the student-athlete principle from this Convention forward than the passage of this proposition. I urge it.

Mr. Paterno: I would like to make two more points. Since "Proposition 48," reaction to it in our high schools has been absolutely tremendous and very inspiring to us who are recruiting. After one year, we have kids taking college board tests earlier, being helped. There was remedial work being done in the high schools. At one time, we were afraid that kids would not aspire to it. We have the same kind of legislation here today. If you give them the challenge and they have to have 1.700 or whatever the fair figure may be in order to participate, they will get that. If institutions are being manipulative, that is obviously a problem for the individual institution. Four or five years ago, the football coaches of the College Football Association passed the academic-eligibility rule that was tougher than this, and the faculty athletics representatives turned it down because it was too tough. So football coaches are not against this.

Anthony R. Kuwalt (Montclair State College): I am opposed to this proposal because it seems to me to be a standard that is below the standard required for graduation and for satisfactory progress. To set a standard for the end of the freshman year at 1.700 would say to a student that you are on probation and you cannot participate in extracurricular activities until you get into a satisfactory academic condition. It seems to me to pass this proposal would set a standard publicly that is less than is regarded as sufficient in many of our institutions across the land, which are requiring higher standards. I would oppose this despite the good intentions of those who favor it.

Olav B. Kollevoll (Lafayette College): There are a number of institutions in this room, I know, who do not require a 2.000 for graduation. Those institutions are fine academic institutions. I would like to know if there are or will be provisions made should this amendment pass that those institutions would not have to have their athletes have a higher grade point than is required for graduation?

[Proposal No. 70 (Page A-55) was defeated by Division I (130-176).]

Academic Reporting

Charlotte West (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 73.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation authorizes the Council to modify academic-reporting requirements in keeping with institutional methods for compiling information concerning admissions standards, academic progress and graduation rates.

[Proposal No. 73 (Page A-57) was approved by Division I.]

Recruiting Contacts

Don J. DiJulia (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 74.

[The motion was seconded.]

This regulation currently is a regulation in Division I football, and the objective of this proposal is to permit a Division I member institution to visit a basketball prospect's academic institution only one time per week for the purposes of recruiting.

[Proposal No. 74 (Page A-57) was approved by Division I.]

Mr. Cryer: It has been indicated to the Chair that No. 75 has been withdrawn.

Letter of Intent — Initial Qualifier

John W. Kaiser [St. John's University (New York)]: On behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 76.

[The motion was seconded.]

The reason for this piece of legislation is to try to do away with some of the difficulties involved with the early signing date. Mr. Chair, I would move to separate (i) and (ii).

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

I would urge the acceptance of (i), which deals basically with the early signing. It would require only that the admissions person in the institution receiving the information can see that eight core curriculum credits were already completed satisfactorily and three more are in progress. There was some indication that people were concerned with a great deal of administrative paper work. We feel this is not so, and that the scenario that I have just described would be the only thing that would be necessary. I would ask that we approve (i) of Proposal No. 76.

Fred Jacoby (Southwest Athletic Conference): Having served as chair of the National Letter of Intent Program since 1973, it is my opinion that the program is working well now because it is simple. It is on one sheet of paper, and we think that it is relatively easy to interpret. I think the intent of the legislation is good, but it adds another factor of determining qualification after the junior year with the entire senior year to go. The purpose of the national letter is to reduce recruiting time and expense on the institution and pressure on the student-athlete. It is our opinion that the earlier signing day was done to simplify this form of the letter. Back when the letter started in 1964, there was one signing date for all sports, which was May 20th. Since that time, we have moved it up. Our purpose in speaking here now is simply one thing; the letter is working because it is simple and relatively easy to administer. Let's not change something that has been a successful administrative instrument that is working. It will place extra pressure on the registrars and the directors of admissions to determine that qualification. Let's keep it simple because that is why it is working.

Mr. Kaiser: I feel that we are not changing much. We are just trying to assist the member institution and the student-athlete in making a considered decision. We have the prospect as we have seen this past year of institutions having athletes sign the National Letter of Intent having no academic information available to them and later on in the year having to not accept them. This is not fair to the institution that has spent time, effort and money to recruit a student-athlete and now another student-athlete who might have filled that spot is not available. Secondly, the student-athletes that has been recruited feels they are going to be accepted; and if they are not accepted at a later date, they might not have any place to go.

Mr. Jacoby: In response to Mr. Kaiser, the institution does not have to sign the student-athlete early. If the institution wants to go ahead and sign without the information, and he is declared as not qualifying, the institution is given the opportunity to recruit a student of similar quality. The current letter under Item A states that if a student does not qualify, the letter is null and void. So, the flexibility is there in the letter right now.

Mr. Kaiser: We understand the flexibility. It is not fair in one instance to the institution and not fair in the other to the student-athlete. We feel that if eight credits are completed, which obviously you would probably have to do to finish eleven, and three are in progress, that will give us a good indication about whether he is going to be accepted.

William J. Flynn (Boston College): I think that Fred Jacoby and his committee have done a marvelous job in regulating the letter of intent. I think it is a good thing. However, I think that the early signing date has been abused. I think that people are signing basketball players in order to keep them away from other institutions. This is a very simple process. We know now that under "Proposition 48" that the high schools are not going to have to certify any more. It will have to be the admissions director that will have to certify that the individual has 11 core subjects and has 700 on the SAT. Certainly, I don't think that an institution should sign an early letter of intent if the admissions director has no transcript. It is simply that the admissions director has a transcript, there are eight core subjects, three more are being taken and that is all there is to it. If the school is challenged, any admissions director has to prove that the student-athlete does have it. I don't think that we are going to expand on that letter of intent. However, the letter of intent has to have a statement that says if a student does not have the core subjects and is not taking three, then the letter will be null and void.

Jack H. Friedenthal (Stanford University): I am a little bit unclear, and I would like to ask a question for clarification of Mr. Jacoby. He indicated that if one does not qualify for admission, the letter of intent is null and void. I do not believe, but maybe I am wrong, that the letter of intent does not refer to Proposal No. 48. A student who qualifies for admission to an institution but who does not qualify in Bylaw 5-1-(j) to which this refers would still be admitted to the institution; and as far as I am concerned, the letter of intent would still be good, would it not?

Mr. Jacoby: Reading from Item 1-A on the letter, it states, "However, these restrictions will not apply to it if you have not by the opening day of the classes in the fall of 1987 met the requirements for admission to the institution named above, his academic requirements for financial aid to athletes, the NCAA requirement for financial aid or for the transfer rule, then the letter is null and void."

Mr. Kaiser: Thank you. I needed that qualification, because I was not sure. Despite the fact that it would not be valid, it seems to me that this is certainly an appropriate requirement. The time has come, it seems to me, that we ought to go beyond even this and make sure that every student who signs the letter of intent has completed an application to the institution which he or she wishes to attend and has been admitted. It seems to me that that would be totally appropriate. This type of proposal, which would require a showing that the individual is likely to achieve the requirements, seems only fair and doesn't get us into game playing with the students. We always have seen that if you are in a game-playing situation — hoping that the student may make it, but not sure, depending on what happens in the next quarter or next semester and whether they can sneak in one course in the high school that might help them or not — it puts a great deal of pressure on the high school. It seems to me this would be a strong incentive to get students started much earlier on making the requirements and would

enforce Bylaw 5-1-(j) principles.

Mr. Jacoby: When the letter started in 1964, the only signing date we had was May 20th. It was the wish of the commissioners and the institutions involved with the letter to move the signing date forward to reduce recruiting time, expense and pressure on the student-athlete. If we would do what the gentleman just mentioned, then we will have to scuttle what we are doing now and move the signing date back to what it was in 1964. We could do that, and then you are going to have constant recruiting all the way through the calendar year until May 20th. I just ask you, is that what the membership wants?

John L. Toner (University of Connecticut): I don't think this proposition places any burden on our athletics commissioners and those who service the letter. It simply places the burden on the university to make certain there is on record sufficient evidence to consider a prospect as a student-athlete and not just an athlete. It seems very fitting legislation, and it is past time that we consider this in the most serious way.

Dave Waples (Gulf Star Conference): If it "ain't" broke, don't fix it. This proposition puts an added burden on registrars and admissions directors. If an individual institution wants to check on the person they are signing, they have a perfect right to find out whether they have eight courses or not. You are telling every other institution what they must do. We just passed a resolution that takes away a year of eligibility if the person is eligible the first year or not. I am saying that the thing is working right now. It has worked for many, many years; and we are just throwing a wrench into it. I would urge that this proposition be defeated.

[Proposal No. 76 (Page A-58) was defeated by Division I after a separate vote on subparagraphs (i) and (ii).]

Letter of Intent — Women's Basketball

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): On behalf of the sponsors, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 77-A.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 77-A establishes a four-day quiet period surrounding the first opportunity to sign a letter of intent in women's basketball only. It has the full support of the Women's Basketball Coaches Association, the Council of Collegiate Women Administrators and is an effort on the part of the women's basketball coaches to recognize this period that is fraught with violations. They would like to clean it up a little. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 77-A (Page A-59) was approved by Division I.]

Women's Softball Recruiting

Fran Koenig (Central Michigan University): On behalf of the Mid-American Athletic Conference, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 79.

[The motion was seconded.]

Passing this proposal puts softball in line with other sports where coaches who attend the National Championship are not put at a recruiting disadvantage by coaches who stay home and use that time to contact respective student-athletes in person.

[Proposal No. 79 (Page A-60) was approved by Division I.]

Self-Financed Visits

Eugene F. Corrigan (University of Notre Dame): I move the adoption of

Proposal No. 86.

[The motion was seconded.]

This merely changes the means that a prospective student-athlete has for attending an athletics contest during a self-financed visit to the campus. He or she can still receive free admissions; but they will be by means of a pass list, which will be similar to what we do with our own student-athletes now.

[Proposal No. 86 (Page A-64) was approved by Division I.]

Mr. Cryer: It has been indicated to the chair that Proposal Nos. 93 and 95 have been withdrawn.

Division I Criteria

Catherine B. Green (University of Washington): I move adoption of Proposal No. 108.

[The motion was seconded.]

Those making this proposal believe that member institutions in Division I should have broad-based athletics programs that provide both team and individual sports and greater participation by both men and women, particularly in the team-sport area.

Don Leahy (Creighton University): I am speaking in opposition to Proposal No. 108. I hear the theme throughout the Convention of cost containment. If this is passed, extensive increased costs will be felt by a number of institutions. I urge defeat of this proposal.

Frank Windegger (Texas Christian University): I also am speaking in opposition to this legislation. Besides cost containment, we also have been talking about fairness. Last year, this body passed a second team-sport requirement. We have a broad-based program; we have 10 women sports. It was necessary for us to add another sport and a facility at a tremendous cost. Now, we are coming right back and being asked to add a third one. Our female population historically chooses their sports. If this is passed by this body, I can see us having to drop one of our historical sports to add a team sport as defined by the Manual. I urge defeat of this legislation.

[Proposal No. 108 (Page A-79) was defeated.]

Mr. Cryer: It has been indicated to the chair that Proposal Nos. 116 and 128 have been withdrawn.

Limitations on Numbers of Contests

Richard M. Bay (Ohio State University): Mr. Chair, who withdrew No. 128? We are one of the sponsors for 128, and I have no knowledge of who withdrew that.

Mr. Cryer: I have been informed that it was withdrawn. If you want to act on it, you may. You are the proposer of it. If you object to the withdrawal, you may move it.

Mr. Bay: I move adoption of Proposal No. 128.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 128 simply serves to reduce from 80 to 60 the permissible number of baseball games in Division I and provides that the permissible baseball and softball games in Division I must be played during the traditional spring season only. The intent of this proposal, I believe, is self-explanatory. To reiterate, it simply limits the number of contests in baseball and softball. Secondly, it limits the contests to a single academic term and/or season. Thirdly, presumably this proposal also would or could reduce lost class time

for baseball and softball athletes in the fall who play games then that do not even count for selection to participate in NCAA competition. Therefore, I would ask the support of this Convention in adopting this proposal.

Ira Michael Heyman (University of California, Berkeley): I would like to make a motion to refer this to the Presidents Commission.

[The motion was seconded.]

If you will recall the resolution that that Presidents Commission adopted in relation to playing seasons, it recognized the fact that the NCAA Council had put together a special committee. It asked that that special playing seasons committee communicate with the Presidents Commission by February 15, and it was indicated that the Presidents Commission in a holistic way wanted to address problems of playing seasons and numbers of contests in legislation for the June Convention. I think it would be better to do it that way rather than to choose out one subject matter presently for consideration.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I am speaking on the referral. I think this is a legitimate proposal. It has been well thought out, and the purpose of this Convention is for us to vote on legitimate considerations rather than always having crisis management and crisis Conventions. We can vote for it or against it, but let's vote for it.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 128 was defeated (124-174).]

Mary Higgins (Creighton University): I urge you to defeat this proposal. Currently, baseball and softball programs do live with the 60-game limit; but it allows the flexibility to play a few games in the fall. Traditionally, those schools that do play in the fall have played just a few games, have traveled very minimally; but it compensates for us who live in the cold, snowy climates to be able to compete because we cannot compete in the colder months of January and February. I think this proposal would turn over national competitiveness completely to the warm-weather schools. It is very difficult for us to get in 60 games in the spring. If this proposal passes, it would encourage us to travel farther South and, therefore, spend more money and miss more days of school. I urge you to defeat it.

Glen C. Tuckett (Brigham Young University): We urge defeat of this particular proposal. Intercollegiate baseball is at a zenith in popularity. We probably have the best programs that we ever have had. The support is at an all-time high. We are concerned about the northern tier schools. They use the fall very effectively for evaluation, selection and limited participation. They have acceptable weather during those periods and are able to utilize that acceptable weather. Regarding the argument about spreading the missed classes or missing classes only in one semester, we think to spread them over two semesters with only a minimal number of fall classes missed is an advantage. Those of us who have been involved in intercollegiate baseball for so long have seen it grow, and one of the reasons it has grown so rapidly and so well is the fact we have been able to utilize the fall of the year to do some very, very important things. Again, we urge that you defeat this proposal.

John W. Kaiser (St. John's University (New York)): I would agree with Glen. I would like to urge you to defeat this proposal. In our area of the country, being one of the cold-weather states, we have had fall baseball for approximately 30 years. There are no abuses. St. John's plays as extensive a fall schedule as anyone. We miss no class. We happen to be in a large

urban area where there are many schools that we can play. The coaches use the time for trial, for instruction and for competition. We feel that this program is the only thing that can keep us competitive on the national scene. In the spring, traditionally, we have to do our preliminary conditioning indoors in the gym and step right out on the field. Basically, we have no more than three or in a good year possibly four weeks for spring competition. To take fall baseball away from us would be a disaster.

Ronald J. Maestri (University of New Orleans): I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 128. Being a warm-weather school, I have sympathy with my colleagues in the North and Northeast. Addressing the situation of missing class time as a former baseball coach, most of the baseball programs in the fall are strictly on an informal basis, very local competition. No class time is missed; and I repeat, I would hope you would defeat this proposal.

Carl F. Ullrich (United States Military Academy): I second all the comments that have been made. Another point, of course, are the early graduation dates. When one has the kind of weather we have in the Northeast and a graduation date in the third week in May, it would just be impossible to get in more than 30 games, much less 60.

Mr. Bay: Mr. Chair, I would simply remind the Convention that the sponsors of this proposal are all cold-weather schools: Michigan, Minnesota, Northwestern, to name a few. So we are not insensitive to some of the arguments that have been raised. The motivation for this legislation, in the first place, I think, is simply consistent with the increasing philosophy that we ought to be in the business of looking to limit the competition and length of seasons.

Mr. Kaiser: I would just like to suggest to the sponsors that certainly they are not forced to play baseball. We would like the privilege of doing that if we feel that would help our programs.

[Proposal No. 128 (Page A-93) was defeated by Division I.]

Maximum Awards — Basketball

Homer C. Rice (Georgia Institute of Technology): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 95.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is another bit of legislation that I would like to see us pass and keep with the same procedures that we had with football this morning in Division I-A. We believe that the number of basketball grants should be reduced from 15 to 13.

[Proposal No. 95 (Page A-71) was approved by Division I. Originally withdrawn but later considered.]

Preseason Practice — Medical Examinations

Jeremy N. Foley (University of Florida): On behalf of the sponsors, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 130.

[The motion was seconded.]

I am head trainer at the University of Florida, and I did a very extensive survey of head trainers across the country. It was felt that the current legislation was too restrictive as far as giving adequate time to do physicals properly. We just believe that this legislation is dealing with athletes already in your program, athletes who have signed to be in your program, and it will allow your medical staff to do a more thorough and better job in giving them their annual physicals.

[Proposal No. 130 (Page A-94) was approved by Division I.]

Basketball Coaching Staff

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 136.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would bring into line the basketball and football staffs, eliminating the part-time coach in basketball. All of us who have dealt with this particular situation know all of the problems that have arisen out of part-time coaches and the way in which they are financed and the way in which their salary is raised through all kinds of circuitous means. It is time for us to take the same step in basketball that we took in football two years ago. I strongly urge the approval of Proposal No. 136.

John W. Kaiser (St. John's University (New York)): We have a legitimate part-time coach who has been with us for many, many years. He is an administrator in a high school and comes and works with the team. I don't think that we should throw people out of work because someone is cheating someplace else. I don't think that is a good reason. The persons, as we have it outlined in our constitution, bylaws and interpretation, are supposed to do a certain job. If people are getting around that situation, we should go and get them. I strongly urge that you defeat this.

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): I have two questions for clarification related to the intent of this. It talks about "replace with attrition." The first situation is a full-time assistant coach in wrestling who leaves the employment of the university. Does that then mean this part-time assistant must move to that slot, and is that an attrition point?

Mr. Cryer: Tom, the answer is no. You can hire another full-time assistant.

Mr. Yeager: And retain the part-time coach?

Mr. Cryer: If he is under contract, you may retain him.

Mr. Yeager: The second situation rests with the contractual arrangement with the part-time coach. Whatever term the contract is for, once the coach's current contract expires, is that an attrition point?

Mr. Cryer: When the part-time coach's contract expires, that is it.

Ferdinand A. Geiger (Stanford University): Mr. Chair, I think the sponsors of this legislation recognize that matters that deal with personnel are indeed more sensitive and sometimes need more consideration. Therefore, as a sponsor of this legislation, I move this be referred to the Presidents Commission.

[The motion was seconded.]

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I would urge us not to refer this proposal. I think this is at an appropriate time for us to take action. We have had a year to prepare legislation for this year. It was properly prepared over that year. It certainly is time for us to vote on something that we did in football two years ago and that proved to be a very positive step in the sport of football to clean up a very bad situation. I urge that we not refer it but vote on it at this Convention.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 136 (Page A-97) was defeated.]

[Proposal No. 136 (Page A-97) was approved by Division I. Originally withdrawn, it then was considered.]

Basketball Coaching Staff

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): On behalf of the sponsors and the National Basketball Coaches Association, I would like to move the

adoption of Proposal No. 137.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the National Basketball Coaches Association, I am requesting that No. 137 be passed to permit Division I institutions to designate any three coaches in the sport of basketball to recruit or scout prospective athletes off campus. The reason for this is that we think the individual institution and the individual head basketball coach knows best which individuals on his staff are able to recruit off campus. This is particularly true in those cases where some assistant coaches are married with families and some of the part-time coaches are single. I request your adoption of Item No. 137.

Marv Harshman (National Association of Basketball Coaches): I believe that you can be much more productive with the use of your personnel if you use someone who is a staff member like a part-time person rather than putting more eggs in more baskets like you do with volunteer coaches and graduate assistants. I think with the cut-back in scholarships, you will need more teaching. You will have more walk-on type people in order to round out your squads. I believe that with the possible curtailment of recruiting periods; you need more people in the field for a shorter period of time, or your recruiting is going to go down. I think that you will see basketball go down. I think it is not a very well-thought-out program. You need three coaches to let the head coach stay on the campus, do the job that he can best do, which is counsel his athletes and see that they do get progress towards education and address other problems that are so prominent now in our programs.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): We are listed as a sponsor, and I am not sure how we got there. I am here to say that I urge you to defeat this proposal. We need to have a full-time employee at the university representing us in the field recruiting, not some part-time coaches paid in devious ways.

[Proposal No. 137 (Page A-98) was defeated by Division I.]

Basketball Coaching Staff

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 138.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think this is an excellent piece of legislation. Most of us don't have enough chairs on our bench to handle the people we have in basketball today. I think this speaks to that issue very clearly and decidedly.

[Proposal No. 138 (Page A-98) was approved by Division I.]

Eligibility

Mr. Cryer: I need to read the following statement to you. "Because of the clerical error in the preparation of the Convention Program, Proposal No. 145 was listed as being an issue available to all divisions as a divided bylaw. Actually, the proposers of this proposition No. 145 desired it to be presented for consideration by Division I only. Therefore, Proposal No. 145 was presented as an amendment for consideration by Division I in this session in its normal order. In order to be fair to those of Division II and Division III who thought that they would be entitled to vote on No. 145 also, this proposal will be considered in the general business session by those divisions. Thus, today's agenda for the Division I business session will also

include consideration of No. 145."

Also, it should be noted that the effective date on this proposal was incorrectly printed. It should read August 1, 1988, instead of 1987.

Gene Bleymaier (Boise State University): On behalf of the Big Sky Conference, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 145.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 145, although it appears to be very simple and simplistic in the book, has significant positive ramifications for the NCAA. There are three main points that this proposal covers. First of all, this is an academic proposal. Secondly, this is a financial proposal; and thirdly, this is a proposal that will affect the freshman-eligibility issue.

This is an academic proposal that will increase graduation rates among student-athletes. Most student-athletes are now on a five-year academic plan but use up their eligibility in less than four years and often leave. We dealt with the entrance requirements last year, and now we need to deal with the point when eligibility has been exhausted at the other end where attrition is the greatest. An NCAA study published in 1981, conducted by the American College Testing Program, found that after five years, only 41.5 percent of all male students graduated, not student-athletes, all male students. They did not consider four years. They looked at five years. Only 41 percent graduated after five years. Now, if we realize there are select institutions where student-athletes may indeed graduate in four years, that is great. Those are not the students that we are worried about. They have gotten their education and received their degree. They are also in a position to decide whether to continue their education at the graduate level to compete for probably one or two extra terms.

Secondly, this is definitely a financial issue. It is a cost-savings measure. This is a proposal where we can save enormous amounts of money without cutting a scholarship and without eliminating a program. I don't know of too many other ways that we can do that. We will be able to save money in two ways. One, because of this proposal, you will be able to reduce your recruiting budgets by 20 percent. The reason you will be able to do that is because you will not be recruiting as many student-athletes each year. You can reduce your budget by 20 percent without reducing the effect of that budget. Secondly, the fifth year can now be funded at no additional cost. Currently, student-athletes without eligibility remaining cost institutions money over and above the scholarship limitation. This would end. In basketball, for example, you will be funding 15 scholarships—now to be 13 under the new rule—while you may have three or four additional student-athletes who are fifth-year seniors. So, you are really paying for 17 or 18 scholarships. Under the five-year proposal, you would only fund 13 scholarships. Thereby, you would be saving money in that fifth year. For those of us, and there are many schools unfortunately, that cannot afford to pay for the fifth year, even though student-athletes need that fifth year of school in order to graduate, the five-year proposal will enable us to provide that fifth year of education at no additional cost to the institution.

Thirdly, this proposal could be the answer to the freshmen-eligibility problem. Many presidents would like freshmen to be ineligible, but the coaches have told us that if you take away 25 percent of their team, they would need additional scholarships in order to compete. Here again, this is a financial issue. If we add scholarships that cost money, there is no way

that a lot of us are in favor of such a proposal, even though in theory you may agree that freshmen ought to be ineligible. The financial implications of that are harmful under such a proposal. The presidents who would like freshmen to be ineligible would basically get what they want under No. 145; because if you have a whole class of fifth-year seniors in your program, very few, if any, freshmen would be able to break into the line-up. The presidents would basically be getting most of what they want—that is take the pressure off of the entering students.

The coaches would not need additional scholarships, because they would have that fifth-year class of students to draw from. Additionally, this proposal simplifies the NCAA Manual, which I think would be very helpful. It does this by eliminating redshirting, and it also eliminates the hardship rule. This proposal would provide a better opportunity for student-athletes than we currently are giving them. It would give them the assurance of five years of education, which most of them need in order to graduate. The satisfactory-progress rule and our eligibility rule that we now work under are geared to five years. If you take 12 hours a term, 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours a year, it will take you five years to graduate.

Some critics of this proposal say that this will be looked upon as exploiting the student-athletes, that we would be using them for another year and we would be sending the wrong message to the media. I have to say to you today that the real exploitation is occurring right now. We use student-athletes for four years, and then we let them go well before they are ready to graduate. We redshirt student-athletes for our benefit, depriving them of the opportunity to compete for an entire year. Some student-athletes who are redshirted at the beginning of the year end up playing late in the year because of injuries to those ahead of them and lose an entire year of eligibility because they may have played in one or two games. That doesn't seem very fair.

In summary, this very simple proposal would, one, increase graduation rates; two, save schools money without cutting scholarships or eliminating sports; three, would basically solve the freshman-eligibility issue; and four, would put an end to the many inequities and exploitation of student-athletes that are occurring now. I urge your support.

William Gurowitz (Cornell University): I urge that you vote against this proposition. We should bring students into our institutions to gain an education for academic reasons. We should help them do that as efficiently and expeditiously as possible. If we vote five years of eligibility, I would predict that the number of them that will take five years to complete their degrees will increase. If we want to deal with the freshman-eligibility problem, we should do that in regard to the resolutions that deal with freshman eligibility and not mix the different issues.

Bradley L. Rothermel (University of Nevada, Las Vegas): I rise in support of this issue, and I urge your support of it. We have examined the potential physical ramifications of this legislation at our institution and have found it to be very substantial.

John W. Sawyer (Wake Forest University): I am impressed by the fact that by going to five years we can save 20 percent. I am more impressed by the fact if we went to six years, we could save 33 1/3 percent. In fact, we could save 90 percent if we just merely go four years.

Eddie M. Jones (Grambling State University): Please forgive me if I do

not try to make this a humorous situation because, in fact, it is not. Voting a five-year eligibility would almost assure that students would graduate. It would assure this because we have set forth satisfactory-progress rules that demand that a student would have 24 hours credit each year for his degree, and the five years would just about put him there. I think it would be advantageous. It would be a move for the betterment of the Association for us to stop being so concerned about what other people think about us and to be more concerned about the student-athletes whom we are using continuously. It is high time that we stopped playing the kinds of games that we play, because everyone around us can see that we are playing. Either we want to get them out of school or we want to use them for the sake of making money.

[Proposal No. 145 (Page A-105) was defeated by Division I.]

Reconsideration of Maximum Awards—Division I-AA Football

Harley W. Lewis (University of Montana): I voted on the prevailing side, and I would like to move for reconsideration of the referral of Proposal No. 96.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to move for reconsideration of No. 96 to put this on the agenda rather than refer it. That has been moved and seconded. I think the message we are attempting to send back to our campuses is cost containment. We have made that message very clear in the sport of basketball. Speaking for my campus, I would like to take that same message back in the sport of football. I also think this would give a message to the special Convention in June that the I-AA football-playing institutions believe in cost containment as well.

[The motion to reconsider the referral of Proposal No. 96 (Page A-71) was defeated by Division I-AA.]

[Note: The delegates approved the slate of candidates from the Nominating Committee for Division I Council positions and Division I vice-president.]

SPECIAL RECOGNITION

Mr. Cryer: I would like to acknowledge, and I am sure all of you also would like to acknowledge, particularly his colleagues and friends in Division I, that this Convention marks the 35th and last Convention for Father Edmund P. Joyce of the University of Notre Dame. Thank you, sir, for your contributions.

[The Division I business session was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.]

GENERAL BUSINESS SESSION

Friday Morning Session, January 9, 1987

The general business session was called to order at 8:00 a.m., with President Davis presiding.

ACCEPTANCE OF REPORTS

[Motions were made, seconded and approved to accept the reports of the sports and general committees, treasurer, Council, Executive Committee and Presidents Commission.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

[Note: The results of votes taken in the division business sessions were reported as the proposals appeared in the Convention Program and are not reprinted here unless additional action was taken. The results also appear in the proceedings of each business session and in Appendix A.]

Consent Package — Constitution, Special Rules

Patricia A. Thompson (Elmira College): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I would like to move adoption of Proposal Nos. 1 through 6.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal Nos. 1 through 6 (Page A-1) were approved as a constitution/special rules consent package.]

Consent Package — Bylaws, Others

Rudy Carvajal (California State University, Bakersfield): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal Nos. 7 through 43 of the consent package.

[The motion was seconded.]

Wilford S. Bailey (Auburn University): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Executive Committee, I would like to make a brief statement regarding Proposal Nos. 18 through 41 in this consent package, with the exception of Proposals 34, 35, 36 and 38, which will be identified later. During 1986, the Administrative Committee considered a detailed report entitled "Comprehensive Reevaluation of NCAA Programs, Services and Management Procedures." This was developed at the request of the Staff Evaluation and the Budget and Program Review Committees expressly for the purpose of achieving increased efficiency in the NCAA organizational administrative structure. In their August meetings, both the NCAA Council and the NCAA Executive Committee approved the staff's recommendation in that report.

Many of these steps dealt with streamlining and heightening the efficiency of the Association's committee structure, and that is primarily what Proposals 18 through 41 in the consent package are designed to achieve. We are proposing to eliminate eight special committees upon completion of their current assignments; and in addition, the legislation will eliminate, combine or restructure a number of standing committees to the end that there would be a net reduction of approximately 20 committees. It is the belief of the Administrative Committee and the Council and the Executive Committee that these steps will increase efficiency and save Association funds in some instances, without impairing the services offered, rendered or adversely affecting the quality of those services.

This does not in any way imply any dissatisfaction with the work of any of the committees that will be dissolved, combined or restructured. All of our committees are performing admirably. It is simply a way to be more efficient and more streamlined in our operations, which have grown considerably with program growth in recent years. There is naturally a reluctance to change what we are accustomed to doing. It is also natural and desirable for every committee to feel pride in its structure, its function and its work product. On those grounds, every committee could argue that they should be allowed to continue as it is and the status quo to be maintained. We would not be able to change our structure or our procedures to be more streamlined or more efficient or more economical with changes in program growth and activity. The NCAA has a history of changing its procedures to meet changing needs. This is another of those times when on behalf of the Administrative Committee, the Council and the Executive Committee we urge that these proposals be left in the consent package and they be adopted as proposed.

We believe that the best interest of the membership and the Association as a whole will be served by this modest restructuring. I assure you that the structure and function will continue to be monitored for efficiency and effectiveness, and changes will be recommended as indicated. Thank you.

Chris Voelz (University of Oregon): Mr. President, I request that Proposal No. 10 be removed from the consent package.

Carl F. Ullrich (United States Military Academy): I request that Proposal No. 8 be removed from the consent package.

James W. Lessig (Mid-American Conference): I request that Proposal No. 20 be removed from the consent package.

Olav B. Kollevoll (Lafayette College): Mr. President, I have a question as far as interpretation is concerned on Proposal No. 38. This proposal states that sports committees have the authority to establish championship criteria and those will apply to in-season play. It says "the above-mentioned committees." In asking the NCAA staff, they stated that this intent was only to have this apply to games that didn't have in-season rules. Now, I don't want necessarily to strike it off the book; but I would like to have an awareness on the part of the membership of just what this means.

President Davis: I believe that for Bylaw 12-5 committees, which do not have responsibility for playing rules in their sports, this says that those committees shall have the authority to establish selection criteria for their championships. Those criteria may include requirements to utilize regular-season playing rules that conform to those used in the NCAA championships. So, all teams coming into the championships administered by those committees will come in after having played during the season under uniform playing rules. This would not mean necessarily that those committees would establish playing rules for the season but only in their selection procedures.

Mr. Kollevoll: It doesn't say playing rules. For instance, if the championship procedures says that you need three officials in the sport of basketball, does that mean that in-season you have to use the three officials?

President Davis: They don't have that authority, and this does not grant them that authority.

George S. King Jr. (Purdue University): Mr. President, I would ask that Proposal No. 30 be removed from the consent package.

[Proposal Nos. 7, 9, 11 through 19, 21 through 29, 31 through 38, 40, 41 and 43 (Page A-5) were approved as a bylaws and other legislation consent package.]

Rudy Carvajal (California State University, Bakersfield): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 8.

[The motion was seconded.]

The proposal would provide latitude to avoid scheduling certified teams on only two weekends. Currently, it is my understanding that there are only five certified games in effect that would add one week to the certification process and deals only with senior-athletes who have concluded their eligibility.

Carl F. Ullrich (United States Military Academy): I have just a quick comment in opposition to this piece of legislation. I think 15 January and the necessity for even our senior athletes to come back and be involved in class is important. I think to extend the date beyond the 15th is not in the best interest nor is it in a direction that we seem to be going right now with emphasis on academics.

Ferdinand A. Geiger (Stanford University): Mr. President, this legislation has been proposed because of scheduling conflicts and problems that come in connection with the date of the Super Bowl. For example, next year if a game like the East-West Shrine game is not allowed to be played on January 16th, it will be required to be played on January 9th. The sponsors will not be able to secure any television whatsoever. The game is for charity, and it has raised millions of dollars for Shrine hospitals. I don't think it is harmful as the first speaker said to what it is we are trying to do and to the individuals involved if we allow these games, the few that there are, to continue to flourish for the charitable causes that they support. I support Proposition No. 8.

[Proposal No. 8 (Page A-6) was approved by all divisions after being removed from the consent package.]

Rudy Carvajal (California State University, Bakersfield): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 10.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will protect the integrity of the NCAA Division I Women's Outdoor Track Championships and at the same time provide the same protection for the men and women's championships equally.

Chris Voelz (University of Oregon): Mr. President, we urge defeat of No. 10 to allow a rewrite. While we agree with the intent of the legislation, we feel it is written in too broad a manner. It not only precludes the student-athlete, who is not qualified for the championships because of competitive standards in attending a sanctioned meet, but also unnecessarily extends the time allotted against other competitions. We urge defeat, which would allow a rewrite to come before you.

[Proposal No. 10 (Page A-6) was approved by all divisions after being removed from the consent package.]

Rudy Carvajal (California State University, Bakersfield): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 20.

[The motion was seconded.]

James W. Lessig (Mid-American Athletic Conference): I request a negative vote on Proposal No. 20 for the following reasons. I can understand and applaud the NCAA Council and the Administrative Committee in their

efforts to streamline and even to eliminate some committees, which would undoubtedly save some valuable dollars. By eliminating the Classification Committee, we may be practicing the old adage of penny wise and pound foolish. If there has been one area that has taken a great deal of our time and effort at recent Conventions, it has been the area of classification and reclassification. Since the 1980 Convention, through this Convention, there have been 87 proposals dealing with some issue of classification. That is an average of more than 10 per Convention. At this 1987 Convention, we will be voting on nine pieces of legislation dealing with classification.

If anything at this time, we should be strengthening this committee, not eliminating it. The purpose of the committee simply stated is to ensure compliance with division criteria. Some may have the false perception that the committee's sole purpose is to review the application of new members. If this were the case, we probably could assign the responsibility to an NCAA staff member. Here is what the committee has been doing and maybe in some cases should be doing: the coordination and monitoring of institutional and conference compliance with the division criteria, this in itself is a major task; the review of all waiver requests for division criteria; looking at specific bylaws such as the increased responsibilities in areas like Division I, women's basketball requirements, Bylaw 11-1-(f); monitoring and looking at Division I minimal contests, and minimal participation requirements, such as in Bylaw 11-4-(6).

Without the Classification Committee, these and other classification problems will fall on the shoulders of NCAA staff members and eventually will add to an already heavy burden of responsibility for the NCAA Council. With the large number of responsibilities now carried out by the NCAA committees, it seems totally inappropriate to eliminate a committee that should be dealing with an area of business, that being classification, which is important enough to average more than 10 separate pieces of legislation at each of the past eight Conventions. I request that we leave this committee in place and give it the charge to solve classification issues. I request a vote against Proposal No. 20.

Mr. Rudy Carvajal: Mr. President, I just want to echo the earlier sentiments of Mr. Bailey. If you look around the organization and determine the number of functions and the numbers of committees that are involved and the staff time that is allotted to those things, a great deal of consideration and time has been put into this consent package. Therefore, I would urge that you adopt it as it has been written in your program exactly and precisely for the reasons that were stated earlier.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): Mr. President, I am a member of the Council and the Administrative Committee. We spent a great deal of time reviewing the report, studying it; and it was not easy to reach decisions to modify the committee structure. For the record, I might point out that one of the committees of which I am a member will be abolished and the duties reassigned under this proposal. We do think the changes are constructive and positive and useful. With particular reference to the Classification Committee, it seems to me that the work of that committee is already very heavily dependent upon the staff. In summary, I would simply urge the delegates to support the proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 20 (Page A-12) was approved by all divisions after being removed from the consent package.]

Rudy Carvajal (California State University, Bakersfield): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 30.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal simply combines the three functions of the Extra Events Committee, High School All-Star Games Committee and the Postseason Football Committee. All three of the certification functions of the committees will begin by combining the current three committees in those areas within about a year and one-half through attrition when it is reduced to a common size.

President Davis: It is my understanding also that the announcement was made the other day that the Postseason Football Committee appointment of a special subcommittee to review the possibilities for a Division I-A championship or play-off would remain intact until it had an opportunity to complete its duties.

George S. King Jr. (Purdue University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Postseason Football Committee, I would like to urge the Convention to defeat No. 30. I certainly do and I think our committee understands the movement of the NCAA to streamline committees, but the timing is probably the most important thing as relates to the Postseason Football Committee. The bowls are in an upheaval at this point in time as I think was pretty obvious in last season's games. The committee really needs not to be watered down at this particular stage of the game so that we can devote our time to a very crucial and a very great concern that we have as it relates to the bowl games. Recognizing what the NCAA is trying to do, I still believe on behalf of the committee that we would appreciate staying intact as a Postseason Football Committee.

[Proposal No. 30 (Page A-18) was approved by all divisions after being removed from the consent package.]

David L. Maggard (University of California, Berkeley): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 44.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Davis: Thank you, David. Let me then read to you the interpretation developed last evening by the Council in response to questions from the membership. The Council has reviewed the application of Bylaw 11-1-(i) and 10-1-(a) with regard to Proposal 44. Bylaw 10-1-(a) provides in part that the Division I members may not vote separately on the definition of commonly accepted educational expenses. It is the Council's interpretation that the regulation would take precedence over the normal legislative principle that only those institutions that sponsor football would vote for regulative issues that pertain only to that sport. Accordingly, if Proposal 44 is adopted, any amendment from any Division I sponsor to increase the maximum amount of financial aid that an individual student-athlete could receive under this regulation would be voted upon by the full Division I membership. This would be the case even if the proposal pertains only to students in the sport of football. Such a proposal would not be voted upon by football sponsors only. It would not be voted upon by Divisions I-A and I-AA separately or together. It would be voted upon by Divisions I-A, I-AA and I-AAA acting as one body.

Mr. Maggard: Thank you for the clarification on that. Proposal No. 44 makes no changes in the value of the grant-in-aid presently being awarded to our student-athletes. This proposal does, however, allow each division

the opportunity of developing future legislation that will allow student-athletes showing a need beyond the grant-in-aid, which is room, board, books and tuition, up to a maximum award of cost of attendance at each institution, to receive it. For those having apprehensions about controlling the cost of attendance or defining the element of cost of attendance, this is a term used by the Department of Education in its regulations and by the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators. The cost-of-attendance elements include the NCAA grant-in-aid, plus an allowance for students' transportation costs and personal miscellaneous expenses. Needy persons on our campuses, other than athletes, already are being awarded cost-of-attendance financial aid packages.

It should be emphasized that athletes will have to qualify for aid beyond the grant-in-aid on the same basis as all students. Similar legislation, such as No. 44, has been before us in the past. This previous legislation set no ceiling or maximum for possible future financial aid legislation. The cost of the attendance establishes a maximum even with the inclusion of the Pell Grant award. This legislation does not increase costs but speaks to the principle of allowing each division, not subdivisions, the autonomy to develop future legislation that may accommodate our needy student-athletes in a legitimate way. With the passage of No. 44, we believe that we are modernizing our capability to be fair to all of our student-athletes. We urge your support of Proposal No. 44.

Jack V. Doland (McNeese State University): In Division I-AA, we were confused on the ruling that we just received from the Council. At the time we did not know whether this was a Division I-A or Division I-AA position or included all Division I. Now that we know it is all of Division I, I would urge our members to support No. 44.

Joseph R. Geraud (University of Wyoming): Mr. President, I have a question concerning interpretations in application of this legislation. As I read it, let us assume that we approve this legislation and then we have a student next fall who has received what we call now a full ride — room, board, tuition and fees. In addition, let us assume the student is in ROTC and is receiving payments. My question is, are those ROTC payments to be awarded only on the basis of financially demonstrated need as will be specified in the constitution? Further, will the limitation of cost-of-attendance restrict and limit how much that student can receive? Under our present constitutional provision, we have excluded ROTC payments from the definition of accountable financial aid. So my question is, does cost of living apply to definitions of financial aid that are now going to be in the bylaws, or will divisions be able to change the bylaws so as to define financial aid as used in the constitution? Is that clear?

Mr. Davis: Those exceptions listed in the program at the bottom of Page 26 and the top of Page 27 of the Convention Program, those five programs will be treated exactly as they are now. They would be excluded from counting towards the maximum allowable aid for that division. They would not be required to have a showing of demonstrated need in order to be excluded.

Mr. Geraud: I appreciate that. Then that leaves it with the position that in the future, each division can amend the bylaws so as to change what is excluded from the limitation found in the constitution?

President Davis: That is correct.

Stanley E. McCaffrey (University of the Pacific): Mr. Chair, I am a

member of the Presidents Commission. I am speaking on behalf of the Presidents Commission in support of Proposition No. 44. I am going to note two provisions that we believe are very important in this proposal. No. 1, there is a cap provided for the maximum permissible amount of financial assistance in that no division may adopt a maximum permissible amount of financial assistance that exceeds the cost-of-attendance that normally is incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at the involved institution. Secondly, there is a provision that any financial assistance permitted by a division in excess of the value of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books shall be based upon the demonstrated financial need of the individual student-athlete. We believe those two provisions provide good insurance, should alleviate any concerns that any may have and the Presidents Commission urges your support of Proposal No. 44.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): I think most of the delegates will recall that in past years I have been involved in debate on proposals to increase or otherwise alter allowable financial aid where I felt that the proposals were adverse to Division II. On the other hand, I understood the merits of those proposals from the standpoint of Division I. It always has been a difficult situation for me to have to oppose legislation that I think has merit in one division but a negative impact in the other. For that reason, I think it is important that we establish the principle of autonomy in this area of very substantive concern. In doing so, I think that the committee has established adequate safeguards that are readily understood; and I would urge the Division II membership to support this proposal. Thank you.

Alvin J. Van Wie (College of Wooster): As a member of the Subcommittee on Financial Aid, I urge the Division III membership to support this important and progressive legislation.

James E. Delaney (Ohio Valley Conference): I rise to support Proposal No. 44. Over the past eight or nine years, I have been involved actively in analyzing, debating in some cases and actively opposing certain Division I autonomy and governance proposals. I have tried on my colleagues the merits of this proposal, and I have concluded that this proposal is well thought out and politically balanced and contains adequate safeguards. The constitution ought to contain fundamental Association principles, and the Bylaws ought to contain operating principles susceptible and responsive to divisional votes. This proposal allocates a relative general principle to the cost of attendance in the constitution and maintains for Division I the opportunity to operate our financial aid definition under one umbrella. I urge your support.

Francis W. Bonner (Furman University): Mr. President, I have one comment. More definition is needed on the term "demonstrated financial need". Do we have a definition as to how that demonstration will be determined, or the process?

Mr. Maggard: I don't know if this will satisfy Frank, but it will be the same as all students on your campus. It will be guidelines by the Department of Education and, of course, then your own institution. I reviewed for you the elements that would be included in this, but the specifics of this would have to be addressed when specific legislation is drawn at a future Convention.

[Proposal No. 44 (Page A-29) was approved (roll-call vote; 549-48, with

seven abstentions).]

Mr. Davis: No. 45 has been withdrawn.

Kathleen M. Wear-McNally (La Salle University): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 46.

[The motion was seconded.]

Robert F. Steidel Jr. (University of California, Berkeley): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 46—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, No. 46—1 simply changes one word. It changes "participation" to "competition". There is no way that we could develop the satisfactory-progress eligibility control before the start of practice, but we can do it by competition. We think that that is just an editorial change.

[Proposal No. 46—1 (page A-31) was approved by Division I and Division II.]

Ms. Wear-McNally: It is the intent of this proposal to require Division I and Division II member institutions to certify eligibility under the satisfactory-progress rule during the fall term of each academic year, to eliminate the option of determining eligibility on the basis of an average of at least 12 hours of academic credit per term of attendance, to require that a student-athlete's annual academic progress be measured from the beginning of the previous regular fall term and to provide an opportunity for a student who is ineligible in the fall to become eligible at the beginning of another regular term. The current regulation provides limited guidance as to when certification for continuing student-athletes must be made. This proposal provides a constant time for certification and also includes relief of those student-athletes unable to meet the certification criteria at the stated time. The proposal strengthens the satisfactory-progress rule through the elimination of averaging options, thereby creating a year-to-year monitoring system. An amendment to the amendment has been submitted clarifying the point that the certification of student-athletes shall be made prior to competition rather than participation.

Mr. Steidel: Mr. President, I was speaking in favor of Amendment No. 46, but I would like a point of clarification. This language is very specific in that the student-athlete is ineligible under this regulation at the beginning of the fall term; eligibility may be reinstated at the beginning of any other regular term of that academic year. That has been interpreted as the first day of classes. Case No. 305 says it can be as early as the day after the last day of the previous term. I suppose that is what is going to happen.

President Davis: Yes, that is correct. The Council has addressed that issue.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group Presidents): Mr. Chair, in the commissioners meetings, both in October and this week, there has been discussion with the staff about the effect of this proposal; and at those meetings, it was stated that Case No. 332-A would continue. There would no longer be any provision for students to take a term off in good standing for any reason to still be eligible for that student's next season of competition. Our understanding at those meetings was that it was the staff's view that Case No. 332-A should continue. If that is true, I think this is a responsible motion. The Ivy league has a proposal, No. 71, that is designed to do that. On the assurance that the case will continue, we would withdraw Proposal No. 71.

President Davis: You have that assurance. That was discussed earlier, and the staff agreed that Case No. 332, the exceptions therein, would still apply if Proposal No. 46 were adopted.

Joseph R. Geraud (University of Wyoming): I would like to speak against adoption of this proposed amendment. We defeated a similar proposal last year. Going back in time, this is one of the most difficult things to achieve in this Convention, that is, some very minimal standard of progress. The rule we now have on the books was the result of a great deal of consideration and evaluation. I do not know why the Council feels that it is necessary to "tighten" the present rule. Our present rule does look at a student's eligibility from the standpoint of his attendance, his season, rather than the regular term of the institution itself. At the present time, if a student-athlete becomes ineligible, he does lose a season of competition. To take away the opportunity to "bank hours" to maintain an average does not make a great deal of sense to me since the rest of the student body has these same kind of privileges. I simply see no reason for the change that will be required by this legislation. The five-year rule is always going to catch the guy who can't keep up.

Richard D. Mochrie (North Carolina State University): As I understand this, if this were to pass, a student could be declared eligible for a spring sport at the beginning of the fall semester. He could have a bad fall semester, and he could participate in the spring sport without having passed 24 hours in the previous 12 months. I don't think that is academically sound. I would oppose the proposal.

Olav B. Kollevoll (Lafayette College): As I read this, a student could pass 30 hours his freshman year, 30 his sophomore year, be in good standing, perhaps maybe an honor student, go into his junior year, and then only pass 21 hours and be ineligible for his senior year. Is that correct?

President Davis: That would be correct for a fall sport.

Mr. Kollevoll: I, therefore, urge the membership to vote against this; because at this point, it also could catch the good student. There might be a good reason why he only passed 21 hours. I think that the option of banking the hours is sound and it is good.

Jimmy C. Stokes (West Georgia College): I would like to urge the Division II members to vote against this proposal. We worked long and hard to get the 15-quarter, 10-semester rule approved to allow a great deal of flexibility for Division II athletes, particularly the minor sports participants who frequently have more than one missed-term opportunity. If this legislation is passed, those students who participate in the minor sports and have more than one missed-term opportunity will be severely penalized because we have no opportunity to take advantage of such things as work study options and in-service training. I urge the Division II members to vote against this proposal.

[Proposal No. 46 (Page A-30) was defeated by Division I (126-169) and by Division II as amended by No. 46—1.]

Football Recruiting and Evaluation Seasons

Albert M. Witte (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 48.

[The motion was seconded.]

Milo R. Lude (University of Washington): Mr. President, on behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 48—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to speak to this, Mr. President. The Pacific-10 Conference, its council and the football coaches looked at Proposal No. 48 long and hard. After discussing it, the idea that the coaches and the Pacific-10 council would like to submit to you is to reduce the current evaluation period by 25 percent rather than what has been proposed. This seems to be a legitimate idea and one that shows interest and shows concern for the evaluation period to be reduced. We recommend the passage of No. 48—1.

Mr. Witte: Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I would urge the members to vote against the amendment. If I may, I will explain our opposition. When we considered the problems associated with the current recruiting and evaluation calendar, it became clear that there are a number of serious problems under the current calendar that the Council felt it was time, in fact long overdue, to address. In order to meet these problems, it was our conclusion that we needed serious measures in order to eliminate or reduce these concerns. First, under the current calendar, approximately eight months of the year is spent in recruiting and evaluation. It is the feeling of the coaches that we have talked to by a large, large majority that that calendar is grossly excessive in terms of their recruiting and evaluation needs. Football coaches depend heavily on film, not on attendance and games for scouting and evaluation purposes. Furthermore, this amendment to the amendment would frustrate other objectives. It would significantly increase the costs that we are trying to reduce by adding two months to Proposal No. 48.

Secondly, it would prevent coaches from staying on campus to deal with the problems of their enrolled student-athletes. Under other initiatives taken by this Convention, it seems more and more clear that coaches should stay at home and deal with the academic and other problems of their enrolled students and not be spending time on the road where those problems are too often ignored or avoided. Furthermore, we think that the evaluation period that is currently in place distorts the recruiting process by putting too much emphasis on the prospective student-athletes, their families and their coaches. We think that Proposal No. 48 unamended will restore a large measure of needed sanity to the entire process. Four months for recruitment and evaluation seems to us to be entirely ample to achieve all those objectives. We urge the defeat of this amendment No. 48—1 and the adoption of No. 48.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): In deference to my good friend Mike Lude, I would urge the Convention to defeat this amendment to the amendment. The original Proposal No. 48 was carefully reviewed by the vast majority of coaches in the College Football Association and strongly supported by the Association of Assistant Football Coaches, and I believe it was a direct recommendation as a result of their work in this field. I think we should listen to them. I think it speaks to the issue of cost containment. I think it speaks to the issue of reducing the opportunity for improper recruiting, and I think it is a positive move for all of us in the area of recruiting in intercollegiate football. I urge the defeat of this amendment to the amendment.

Vincent J. Dooley (University of Georgia): I would like also to speak against the amendment by giving a little background. Several years ago, the intensity of recruiting competition caused almost a complete 12-month

recruiting calendar, at which time some 50 coaches, Division I-A coaches, met in Dallas and hammered out the first recruiting calendar that later became the law that has been a good one. Two years ago, the American Football Coaches Association appointed a new standing committee of assistant coaches. Among that very active committee's decisions was a survey that resulted in a large majority of the assistant coaches throughout the country voting in favor of a further reduction in the evaluation and contact period of recruiting, the reason being that they needed to stay at home more with their football team on campus and they certainly would have enough time starting in the first of November and the limited period in May in order to do the proper evaluation. That recommendation was brought last June to Dallas when some 45 Division I-A coaches met and discussed this in great detail. We had representatives from across the country, and November 1 was the date that we all agreed upon. So in light of that, I would like to urge the defeat of the amendment and the passage of No. 48.

[Proposal No. 48—1 (Page A-32) was defeated by Divisions I-A, I-AA and II.]

[Note: The order of consideration of proposed amendments was changed to consider Proposal No. 48—3 before No. 48—2.]

L. Oval Jaynes (Colorado State University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Western Athletic Conference, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 48—3.

[The motion was seconded.]

I am fully aware of the amount of time that coaches spend on the road; but in the case of certain areas of the country, because of high school competition, because of weather restrictions, so many games are played and are finished by early October. If we allow November 1 to be used as the start of evaluation, it would put an extreme hardship on those schools that are in areas of the country where their competition so many times are completed by the end of October and by the first week in November. I would ask that we support Proposal No. 48—3 to allow our coaches an opportunity to evaluate those student-athletes during the month of October. Thank you.

Mr. Witte: Mr. President, Proposal No. 48—3 was not, as I recall, brought before the Council; so I cannot speak in opposition to it on behalf of the Council. As chair of the Special Council Subcommittee to Review the Recruiting Process, I do wish to express my opposition to this, or for that matter to any other amendment to the amendment that would erode our objectives before they are put in place. We considered very carefully the fact that there are different problems in different areas of the country with regard to football scheduling. We also listened very carefully to the coaches who advised us that attendance at these games is not for evaluation but for the purpose of public relations or good will. The evaluation is done in the film room. Thus, we do not think that the hardship is nearly as burdensome as has been presented. In trying to grapple with the serious problems, the Council adopted the concept of a four-month calendar for recruiting and evaluation for all sports.

Douglas A. Dickey (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): I would like to urge you to support this amendment. I would like to congratulate Mr. Witte on the job his committee has done. I think there are a number of us who have a significant amount of our budget involved with the sport of football. In our case, some 90 percent of a very significant budget is involved with

the sport of football. You are taking a recruiting period of four months from August 1 to December 1 and cutting it down by 75 percent, which I think is too severe.

We need to be careful of the restraints we put on this recruiting horse that we are all riding. In our case, where we are in a spot where we have fewer high school football programs, fewer number of people, I think this would make severe inroads into our competitive element. I would ask all of you who might find yourselves in that position to consider the severity of this move. To make some restraining efforts to curtail recruiting, I think is very good. We are in favor of it. But this is too steep a cut. Let's start by getting a compromise here of October 1, keeping people home in August and September to let the high schools get going and get our own programs going. Then let's take a look at it. If a year from now you want to tighten it again, then we will be willing to consider that. I think this is too severe a cut at this point in time.

Milo R. Lude (University of Washington): Mr. President, I heard what Mr. Witte has said. When the Council met in Seattle, I sent a message by a member of the Council that Don James, our football coach and chair of the NCAA Recruiting Committee, would be available and would be delighted to discuss these rules or the potential rules relative to the recruiting calendar and the evaluation calendar. To my knowledge, Mr. James was not invited. He has passed on to me, and I think it is important to share with the Convention delegates, that not all coaches favor this severe a cut and that his committee did not favor this severe a cut.

Robert S. Devaney (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): I have to agree with Mike. I don't feel that all of the coaches were in favor of this cut. I know that at our school they were not in favor of it. I don't think it is correct to say that all the football coaches were in favor of this.

Vincent J. Dooley (University of Georgia): I am not sure who said that all the coaches were in favor of it. I did make a statement that some 44 Division I-A coaches that attended the meeting in Dallas last year were in favor of the 1st of November evaluation period. Also, I made the statement that a large majority, a great majority of the assistant coaches that were polled throughout the country by the Assistant Coaches Committee of the American Football Coaches Association, were in favor of reducing the evaluation period to the first of November.

Jack V. Doland (McNeese State University): I agree with the people who have said this is too drastic. I think October 1 would be a very good compromise in this particular matter for football coaches.

[Proposal No. 48—3 (Page A-33) was defeated by Divisions I-A (48-61), I-AA and II.]

Milo R. Lude (University of Washington): With the great winning streak we have going here, I move adoption of Proposal No. 48—2.

[The motion was seconded.]

The proposal here is to take the month of May and reduce the evaluation period from the current 31 days to 21 days, May 10 through the 31st. The Council's proposal is somewhat less than that, and the reason we are suggesting at least a few more days is because it has become a very important part of most universities' programs. This is the time that the coaches can communicate with the guidance counselors, the principals and the coaches, and carry the word about "Proposition No. 48" better than any other liaison

people in the whole organization. So I suggest to you that this is really important academically, and it is vital to the success of "Proposition No. 48."

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): On this amendment, I would concur. I would believe, Vince, this is more closely aligned with the dates that were originally suggested in Dallas by the CFA coaches. I think for the very reasons that Mr. Lude has talked about with regard to the ability to secure academic records and academic information, the spring is vital; and I believe with this amendment to the original amendment, Proposal No. 48, will be an excellent piece of legislation.

Mr. Witte: Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I would ask the membership to oppose No. 48—2. I think that ordinarily I would be very embarrassed to take that position, because it seems somewhat unkind to be quibbling over a week. In this instance, I am not at all embarrassed for this reason. We are trying in the Council to establish a uniform calendar for all sports of four months. We have worked very hard to come up with what we think is a sane recruiting and evaluating calendar in football and in the next proposal for basketball. Currently, surveys are underway to determine from the sports committees what would be a sensible four-month recruiting and evaluation calendar in all other sports. It is hoped that we will be able to present legislation along those lines at the next Convention. No. 48—2 would erode the concept that we are trying to establish. For that reason, I would ask the Convention to vote against it.

[Proposal No. 48—2 (Page A-33) was approved by Divisions I-A, I-AA and II. First defeated in Division I-AA and II, later motions to reconsider were approved and both divisions approved the amendment.]

[Proposal No. 48 (Page A-32) was approved by Divisions I-A, I-AA and II as amended by No. 48—2.]

Basketball Recruiting and Evaluation Seasons

Albert M. Witte (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 49.

[The motion was seconded.]

Fran Koenig (Central Michigan University): Mr. President, I would move adoption of Proposal No. 49—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

There are five states in which high school girls play basketball in the fall. The legislation, Proposal No. 49, as written would mean those young women would not have comparable opportunity to be seen by college coaches as would girls who play in the traditional winter season, since fall basketball is over before the December 11-to-31 evaluation period. No. 49—1 would substitute the November 8-to-November 28 period for the December 11-to-31 dates only in states where girls play fall basketball. The number of days is identical, and each includes a major holiday. We see no unfair advantage given to any group if No. 49—1 is adopted. We fully support cutting back on the time coaches must be off campus, but we feel this change is necessary to permit the high school girls in those five states to have equitable opportunity to have their skill evaluated. We recommend adoption of No. 49—1.

Mr. Witte: Mr. President, the Council had an opportunity to review No. 49—1 and strongly urges the Convention to adopt it. It seems to be a very fair solution to a difficult problem.

[Proposal No. 49—1 (Page A-34) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Mr. Witte: Mr. President, in support of No. 49 as amended, the Council recognizes that this is a very serious step in the area of a calendar for recruiting and evaluation in the sport of basketball. It is fair to say that most of our time during the past year was spent on this issue. Currently, recruiting evaluation takes more than eight months in this sport. We talked to a good sample of coaches and commissioners of basketball conferences, and none of them defended the current calendar. It is obvious that it is difficult to come up with a perfect solution, but we think that the four-month calendar presented here best meets all of the objectives that were summarized earlier and will permit competitive equity among basketball-playing schools. For those reasons, we urge the adoption of No. 49 as amended.

[Proposal No. 49 (Page A-33) was approved by Divisions I and II as amended by No. 49—1.]

Coaches Outside Compensation

Kathleen M. Wear-McNally (La Salle University): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Special Committee on the Review of Coaches Outside Compensation, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 50.

[The motion was seconded.]

Richard D. Mochrie (North Carolina State University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 50—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

What we have done is to change the wording slightly so that the coaches will still be reporting the sources of income although they would not be reporting the dollars of income. The reason that we submitted this amendment is that our faculty consulting roles in the universities of North Carolina require all faculty who consult to report the sources of the company they consult with. They are not required to report dollars. Many of our coaches are voting members of our general faculty, and we don't feel it would be fair to treat the coaches differently than we do the rest of the university employees. So I would urge your acceptance of this amendment, which would require them to report the sources but not the dollar amounts that result from those contacts.

[Proposal No. 50—1 (Page A-34) was defeated.]

[Note: Proposal No. 50—2 was withdrawn.]

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Southern Conference, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 50-3.

[The motion was seconded.]

We strongly believe that the original amendment, which the Southeastern Conference supports, had one glaring weakness; and that is the chain of the reporting. We believe very strongly that the athletics director should not be left out of that chain of reporting and that it is most unfortunate that if a coach and a president in all due respect to the college presidents here negotiate a contract without the knowledge of the athletics director, there is no way one can enforce the discipline within the department of athletics. We think it is most significant that this procedure be followed, and we urge your support of this amendment to the amendment.

[Proposal No. 50—3 (Page A-35) was approved.]

Ms. Wear-McNally: There has been a concern that institutions, particularly the chief executive officers of the institutions, are often unaware of all

income received by members of the coaching staffs. This proposal would require coaches' contracts with member institutions to include a stipulation that the coach must report annually all athletically-related income from a source, any source, outside of the institution. This proposal does not limit coaches' income but provides the chief executive officer with complete information and additional administrative control. This proposal enables the CEO to be aware of any possible influence over a member of his coaching staff. Possible conflict of interest can be readily identified. This is important in the light of institutional responsibility under NCAA rules for the coaches' actions when they are contrary to NCAA regulations. Let me point out that the survey conducted by the special committee indicated that 87 percent of the CEO's and 70 percent of the athletics directors favored such regulations in contrast to the 80 percent of the men's basketball coaches and 60 percent of the football coaches who opposed this proposal. The proposal includes examples of the types of income that must be reported annually.

Lawrence E. Fitzgerald (Southern Connecticut State University): Mr. Chair, just for clarification, our full-time coaches are also faculty members. They are covered under collective bargaining agreements negotiated system-wide. We have no separate contracts with coaches. Therefore, there is no way to provide or to honor the intent of Proposal No. 50. Does this mean that it applies, does not apply, or must we negotiate separate contracts because of it?

President Davis: We will work this out with your specific institution. There are already constitutional requirements that deal with contractual arrangements with coaches. My own personal opinion is that you have some sort of contractual arrangement with all of your faculty. It may be an annual appointment or a written understanding with your faculty; and if that is indeed the system that you have with your institution for coaches as well, this would require you to include these stipulations within those sorts of employment agreements.

Homer C. Rice (Georgia Institute of Technology): In my opinion, we are going beyond the many forms we have to fill out now. I believe this is an institutional autonomy issue, and it can be controlled by any institution that desires that. It need not be a written statement from this group.

John W. Kaiser (St. John's University, (New York)): I would like to agree with Mr. Rice. We believe firmly that this is an institutional matter that should not be addressed on the national level. We have variety in the type of institutions we have, and we feel this should be part of the contract or individual agreement at the institution with the coach.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): Mr. President, I would like to speak in favor of Proposal No. 50. In addition, I am in support of Nos. 51, 52 and 53. Although 50 might, in the view of some, not be tough enough, it does at least attempt to bring back into focus why we as academic institutions do exist. That is the point. We are academic institutions. We are not sports promoters or fan clubs for the National Football League or the National Basketball Association. It is one thing for a professor of pathology or a heart transplant specialist to earn income more than the president of that research institution, but it is something else when the head football coach or the athletics director of that institution earns more annually than either person.

Our priorities somehow have become disarranged. We have been impaled upon sports professionalism. Something is terribly wrong when the Divisions I-A or I-AA coach can command more annual compensation by pushing a camera or a name-brand shoe or teaching at some basketball coaches clinic than can an engineering professor who is teaching future engineers of space. The coach is ultimately, I think, the compensation winner, not the kids. Yes, we as college administrators and faculty have been pushed, pawed, gerry-rigged and lassoed by the media as fast-buck hustlers. I think the time has come to say now is enough; and I sense that perhaps we, at least many of us like myself, are of the opinion that as university people we might very well be fed up with the sellers of the athletics apparel hustle, the advertisers of the 30-second spots on television after the fourth down field goal, the pushers of this championship game or that one. It is time, therefore, to get their salaries in line, to rearrange the priorities and for us to once and for all call the shots.

John D. Galaris (Salem State College): Mr. Chair, I rise to speak against No. 50 because it really is talking to Divisions I and I-A football and basketball issues. There are a group of schools here, including my institution, that have part-time coaches; and I find this particular piece of legislation very offensive because their primary source of revenue is not coaching. I think a larger percentage of our membership is in the same category.

Paul A. Haubrich (University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee): I find it unfortunate that this Convention is going to try to create a standard for coaches that would be potentially greater than it would be for any other employee of the universities at which they are working. I don't think you can impose more upon one individual than another. In terms of an individual's rights, they should be protected in that sense. However, I think that there has been a continuing national trend to try to exert some control upon this particular area.

However, let me suggest that this all might be moot since the changes will be coming down from the Internal Revenue Service in reporting your income to your employer. Basically, the new W-4 form that you will have to fill out will not only give all the income that you have; but you will have to report it to your employer anyway. That is becoming a moot issue as far as I am concerned with respect to what is being developed.

[Proposal No. 50 (Page A-34) was approved as amended by No. 50—3.]

Institutional Endorsements

Fredrick Hemke (Northwestern University): On behalf of the Council and the Special Subcommittee to Review Coaches Outside Income, I move adoption of Amendment No. 51.

[The motion was seconded.]

The rationale behind the subcommittee's decision to submit this is pretty straightforward. Recognizing the institution's name and logo are the property of that institution, the subcommittee wished to provide a process of control and accountability that is clear and evident to athletics departments staff members. This proposal does not prohibit staff members from receiving compensation for endorsements using the institution's name or logo. It only requires that prior approval from the institution has been received, and the institution thereby has been made aware of the use. Such approval could be handled one instance at a time or it could be authorized in the staff member's contract or understanding, along with any restrictions

on such endorsements. The subcommittee believes this to be a positive approach that will clarify for both the staff member and the institution the process and procedure for using the institution's name and logo. We recommend your support of the proposal.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): A point of clarification, please. Does the introduction of an individual as the coach at a certain institution implicate the institution? In other words, in relationship to endorsement of products if an individual is identified as the coach of blank institution, does that indicate then that is by implication that the institution endorses the product?

President Davis: We believe it does not.

[Proposal No. 51 (Page A-35) was approved.]

Endorsement Funds

B. J. Skelton (Clemson University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 52.

[The motion was seconded.]

Numerous concerns have been expressed by coaches receiving compensation for use of particular athletics shoes, apparel or equipment by the student-athletes of their respective institution. This proposal would require that institutions' CEO's approve such compensation before it is received, or that the institution administer the funds. It is thought that such compensation should at least be approved by the CEO, inasmuch as it is received as a direct result of its use by that institution's student-athletes. I would point out that in the survey that we conducted of Division I members that 77 percent of the CEO's favored this proposal, 57 percent of the AD's favored this and conversely only 20 percent of the football coaches and only six percent of the men's basketball coaches favored it.

[Proposal No. 52 (Page A-36) was approved.]

Personal Compensation

Charlotte West (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 53.

[The motion was seconded.]

Administrators have generally agreed that athletics department staff members should not profit personally in scheduling the institution's athletics contests. Any compensation for participating in a particular contest or event on behalf of a member institution should be paid to the institution. The institution then can make the decision as to how its staff member should be compensated from all funds controlled by the institution, including those from contests in which the institution competes. Receipt of payments from anyone other than the employed institution for scheduling contests may violate state or federal laws and ethics regulations. There is no uniformity across the nation. This proposal would prohibit such payment in all instances. If a payment is received by a staff member for other duties, those that are not prohibited by his or her contract with the institution in conjunction with competition — such as a speaking fee — the payment would not be prohibited by this legislation if it can be demonstrated that it is for work actually performed and at a rate commensurate with the going rate in that locality for such services. Inflated compensation would violate this regulation. This proposal was favored by 98 percent of the CEO's, 92 percent of the athletics directors and 86 percent of the football coaches, as

well as 56 percent of the men's basketball coaches responding to the special committee's survey of Division I members.

Olav B. Kollevoll (Lafayette College): Did I hear correctly in that if a contest were scheduled or a tournament scheduled and your coach actually performed or lectured at a clinic there, that the compensation was okay?

President Davis: Only if the payment is commensurate with the going rate for lecturing at clinics or seminars. There is no problem if the coach does that in connection with a scheduled contest. The thing we want to avoid is the coach receiving an honorarium as a subterfuge for receiving personal compensation for making the schedule in the first place.

[Proposal No. 53 (Page A-36) was approved.]

Enforcement — Preliminary Inquiry

Thomas J. Niland Jr. (Le Moyne College): Representing the Committee on Infractions, I move adoption of Proposal No. 55.

[The motion was seconded.]

I will not bore you with the intent. It is well-written and exactly as we asked for it to be. We trust this will speed up the process both for the college and the NCAA administrative staff.

Very Rev. L. Edward Glynn (St. Peter's College): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Presidents Commission, I wish to inform the Convention that the Commission has voted to support Proposal No. 55.

[Proposal No. 55 (Page A-37) was approved.]

Enforcement — Prehearing Case Summary

Milton R. Schroeder (Arizona State University): On behalf of the Committee on Infractions, I move adoption of Proposal No. 56.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this proposal is to improve the procedures before the hearing process that occurs before the Committee on Infractions by making available to all the parties information that will help them better prepare for those hearings. It does this in two ways. First, it permits the enforcement staff to share with the institutions and individuals affected the information the staff has collected during its investigation and that the staff will present during the hearings. The proposal provides that the information will be made available in a manner that protects its confidentiality. Without this proposal, the current enforcement policies limit the access to this information that the staff may allow. Second, Proposal No. 56 will help the parties and the committee to prepare for the hearings by requiring the development of a written summary of the case that would be given to all prior to the hearing. This will help everyone identify the areas of agreement and to focus the hearing on the important issues that are in dispute. Finally, it is important to note that there is a safeguard in this proposal to protect against those few who might seek to learn the nature of the NCAA's case so they might devise a defense that is less than forthright. Under this proposal, the staff will not make information available until after the written institutional response has been submitted. This permits the committee to continue as it does now to evaluate the commitment that has been paid to a thorough institutional investigation and the candor of the discussion of NCAA involvement by the individuals concerned. The committee believes this proposal will improve our hearing procedures, and we ask for your support.

Very Rev. L. Edward Glynn (St. Peter's College): Again, on behalf of the Presidents Commission, I inform the Convention that the Presidents Commission has voted to support this proposition.

[Proposal No. 56 (Page A-38) was approved.]

Enforcement — Infractions Reports

D. Alan Williams (University of Virginia): On behalf of the Committee on Infractions, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 57.

[The motion was seconded.]

For a number of years, the report of the Committee on Infractions and the sponsors on behalf of the institutions have contained the words "confidential report." In this day and age, there is little that is confidential in any way; and it has created what we see as both an inequity among institutions and a great deal of confusion on behalf of member institutions. We find that as we have been working with institutions, and particularly with the press, that the need for the report to be more open and to be more public will enhance the effectiveness of the enforcement program and will be a benefit to both the committee and to the institution. What this does is to provide that there will be one report, one public statement by the committee, and that this will be public notification to the institution. We find that institutions that have been before the committee are now, I think, in favor of this as they have worked through the process. We urge your support. We think this will help the total program of the Association.

Very Rev. L. Edward Glynn (St. Peter's College): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I inform the Convention the Commission has voted to support Proposal No. 57.

Robert H. Frailey (American University): A point of information. Does this mean that the investigation will be made public prior to an institution's appeal? If so, is that wise?

Mr. Williams: The answer to that question is yes. You should understand that our intent is to send the report to the institution. Once the institution has received it, the report would be made public. This would be after the institution receives it, and this would eliminate the confidential report now in terms of the period between the time some institutions receive it and make an appeal. Most institutions no longer have the privilege of keeping that confidential. We want to have the uniform policy for all institutions.

Thomas J. Niland Jr. (Le Moyne College): This is presenting an interesting question. We find it necessary to make this public after the institution receives it, because of the various state laws and the various government functions, and make it available to the media. Sometimes, misinformation is given rather than the exact information. The right to appeal in all kinds of constitutional matters is still there and could erase what has taken place. It clears up rather than giving misinformation about what has taken place.

[Proposal No. 57 (Page A-39) was approved.]

Enforcement — Public Comment

D. Alan Williams (University of Virginia): On behalf of the Committee on Infractions, I move adoption of Proposal No. 58.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this amendment, I think, is clearly stated. At present, the enforcement staff does not make any comment on the process of an infrac-

tions case. It can not make any comment. That would continue to be the situation unless an institution or a particular coach or person who has received a preliminary inquiry or initial inquiry may comment and those comments were contrary to the actions that had taken place. This would be a limited opportunity on the part of the enforcement staff to make comment to correct or to expand. It would not be comment on the case itself.

Very Rev. L. Edward Glynn (St. Peter's College): Again, on behalf of the Presidents Commission, I inform the delegates that the Presidents Commission has voted to support this proposal.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): A point of clarification. This says information made public by the institution or information that is made public. How will that be determined?

Mr. Williams: It is our intent that it will be information made public by the institution and would have to be information made public by the institutional representative. It could not be reports that just come out in the press. This would be strictly institutional comment.

[Proposal No. 58 (Page A-40) was approved.]

Executive Director

Tom Butters (Duke University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 59.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is a self-explanatory and hopefully noncontroversial proposal. We believe a position as important as the executive director of the Association should be approved by not only the NCAA Council but also the Presidents Commission as well.

Edward E. Bozik (University of Pittsburgh): I would like to report to the Convention that the Executive Committee and the Council endorses this proposal. The current procedure that was approved by the Executive Committee does required the substantial involvement of the Presidents Commission in the form of approval of the appointment of the executive director. We support and urge the Convention's support.

[Proposal No. 59 (Page A-40) was approved.]

Financial Audit

Warren C. Bowlus (University of Wisconsin, Stout): On behalf of the Wisconsin institutions listed, I move adoption of Proposal No. 60.

[The motion was seconded.]

The members of the Wisconsin State University Conference and the Wisconsin Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Conference are in total support of Proposal No. 60. This amendment to the financial audit, when adopted, will allow institutions that desire to follow the existing requirement, yet provide flexibility for those members who prefer to handle their audit internally. Only the external audit requirement has been deleted from the intent. The deletion will save significant dollars in the case of Wisconsin schools, \$5,000 per campus, from already restricted budgets. We ask for the adoption of Proposal No. 60. Thank you.

Very Rev. L. Edward Glynn (St. Peter's College): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I inform the Convention that the Commission voted to oppose this proposal.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): Mr. Chair, as a member of the NCAA Council, I would point out to the delegates that passage of this amendment would delete the requirement for an outside audit; and it was

the intent of the original legislation specifically to require an external audit so there would not be room for institutional discretion. This would essentially eliminate the requirement. I would urge the delegates to vote against it. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 60 (Page A-41) was defeated.]

Financial Audit

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 61.

[The motion was seconded.]

As the author of this amendment and representing the members of the Northern California Athletic Conference, I ask for the support of this membership to exclude those institutions that have operating budgets of \$300,000 or less from the annual audit requirement. I don't think the original legislation pertaining to this potential misuse of funds in the athletics department was pertinent to those institutions. I think its intentions were for other institutions of larger budgets. By helping us with this amendment, it would relieve some extraordinary expenses for institutions with budgeting levels at the amount mentioned in this amendment. Our bidding level right now is \$4,500. As the gentleman from Wisconsin said, they are spending \$5,000 per campus. That is absurd in the eyes of the seven presidents in our conference. We ask for your support of this. Thank you.

Very Rev. L. Edward Glynn (St. Peter's College): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I inform the Convention that the Commission has voted to oppose this proposal; and we urge that you also oppose it.

Anthony R. Kuolt (Montclair State College): We in Division III are faced with a very serious problem. Our vice-president for finance has informed me that if a full audit is required, it would be \$15,000 for them to do a complete audit. This would be by one of the Big Eight companies that would have to come in to do it. That is all the State of New Jersey would accept for an outside audit. We think this proposal upholds what you people are trying to do with Division I and does not affect that. However, it certainly will affect many of the small colleges to the extent that we feel that we would probably have to cancel one or two or three of what are considered minor sports to make up this deficit. We ask your support on behalf of the Division III schools.

B. Boyd Benjamin (Barry University): Mr. President, I rise in support of this amendment in that our small school with a budget that is considerably less than \$300,000 was given a quotation by one of the people who does business with us on a regular basis, one of the large firms. That quotation was \$10,500, which is considerably larger than 10 percent of our athletics budget. I, therefore, urge you all to support this on behalf of the small schools.

Richard Kaiser (Willamette University): I rise to gain support for this amendment, representing only three NCAA Division III institutions in the entire three-state area in the Pacific Northwest. As we try to gain momentum for institutions to join the NCAA, if the audit were to come into play, it would be a detriment to our effort to gain more support for the NCAA in Division III.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): I am mindful of the concerns of the Division III members. If the proposal provided only to exempt Division III from the requirement, I probably would support it. I would support such

a proposal down the road, if possible, to do it that way. However, I would point out that if you study the audit guidelines carefully, it is possible to minimize the cost of the external audit by doing much of the detail work internally and relying upon the external auditor through tests and so forth to verify it and certify the results. I do think in Division II that this proposal would generate some of the most creative accounting practices that one could imagine, because there are a number of Division II institutions where it would be possible through the allocation of expenditures to other accounts, and so forth, to evade the audit requirement. I think that was one of the things that this Association has done that in the long run will do the most to enhance institutional control of our athletics programs. I would urge the defeat of the amendment.

Bob Moorman (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): We happen to be Division II also, and I don't want everyone to think that he is speaking for all of the Division II institutions. We urge support of this.

Robert Barkey (Sonoma State University): I want to be clear. The Northern California Athletic Conference is Division II. It is a nonscholarship conference, the only Division II nonscholarship conference in the country. There are many, many other Division II programs across the country that are sponsoring eight or ten sports that are within this limit. I don't believe there is enough pressure on any CEO at any of these small institutions, spending those small amounts of dollars, that we have to worry about their integrity. It clearly says that the CEO has to verify in writing what the operational budget is. We do need your help not only for Division III, but for many members in Division II that are at this level of spending.

C. Ann Uhler (Texas Woman's University): I would speak in support of this motion. We are a Division II institution; and in the number of bids we have attempted to receive, the best we have been able to achieve with an internal audit preceding it would exceed five percent of our operating budget. I would urge support of this motion.

Kenneth J. Weller [Central College, (Iowa)]: Mr. Chair, I am a member of the Presidents Commission and wish to report to the body that this decision of the Presidents Commission was not unanimous. The Division III presidents were in sympathy with many of the expressions of opinion that you have heard. We would urge the body to give consideration to this proposal and to vote in favor of it. The matter of creative accounting, it seems to me can be handled through the interpretations process of the Association in the defining of what is meant by operating budgets. I recognize that this proposal flies in the face of the intent of the original proposal of the special Convention, but I do not believe that the body intended that to be done for all institutions with equal impact. I believe that the smaller institutions would be greatly favored without in any sense undermining the intent of the original motion.

[Proposal No. 61 (Page A-41) was approved.]

Recruiting — Basketball Evaluations

President Davis: Proposal No. 80 has been withdrawn.

Gene E. Hooks (Wake Forest University): Mr. President, as a representative of the Division I-A football athletics directors, I would like to object to the withdrawal of this proposal.

President Davis: If you object to it, it is the property of the Convention; and you may move it.

Mr. Hooks: I move adoption of Proposal No. 80.

[The motion was seconded.]

We certainly respect the presidents and don't propose to put ourselves in an adversarial relationship with them. However, we do believe this is an excellent piece of legislation and that it should be instituted immediately. It will affect 1987-88 budgets and administrative procedures. The proposal would enable all of us to put some sanity back into recruiting and to prevent our coaches from babysitting basketball players for 20 and 25 times during the year. For that reason, we would like to propose this legislation. We believe it is good legislation and that it should be adopted immediately.

[Proposal No. 80 (Page A-61) was approved. Originally withdrawn, it later was considered.]

Evaluation Periods

Robert R. Snell (Kansas State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 83.

[The motion was seconded.]

I believe it is clear that it is a noncontroversial proposal, and I would simply urge your support for it.

[Proposal No. 83 (Page A-62) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Recruiting — Printed Recruiting Aids

Mary Roby (University of Arizona): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 88.

[The motion was seconded.]

I move adoption of Proposal No. 88—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this, of course, is to provide specifications that would cut printing costs. It has been pointed out that very often institutions are able to produce publications on ordinary size paper, eight and one-half by 11, much more inexpensively than the smaller usually printed five by 10 size. This is particularly true in the nonrevenue sports. Therefore, we support Proposal No. 88—1.

[Proposal No. 88—1 (Page A-65) was approved by all divisions.]

[Proposal No. 88 (Page A-65) was approved by all divisions as amended by No. 88—1.]

Printed Recruiting Aids

Bruce A. Corrie (Bucknell University): Mr. Chair, I move adoption of Proposal No. 89 on behalf of the sponsoring members.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this proposal is to allow one recruiting brochure per sport per year and not get hung up on its size, shape or content. I think the way the legislation is currently written and interpreted, it is too restrictive. Our concern is that as long as it is limited to one per sport per institution per year that there should not be any problem with it. So I urge the members to adopt the proposal to allow a brochure to be of any size or shape. If your brochure happened to unfold into three pages and somebody wanted to hang it on the wall, it would not preclude your being able to do that because somebody interpreted that as a poster.

[Proposal No. 89 (Page A-66) was approved by Division III, defeated by Divisions I and II.]

Tryout Rule — Awards

John P. Reardon Jr. (Harvard University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 90.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment is prompted by the fact that many member institutions host major athletics competitions for high school students, especially track meets. Some of these events are older than the NCAA. Most of these competitions are open to at least a number of high school teams, and they are sanctioned by state high school associations. This proposal makes it possible for winning participants to receive awards. Some may worry about recruiting advantages; but I don't believe that a high school student is going to select a college based on winning a first-, second- or third-place ribbon, medal or certificate. As an example, the University of Pennsylvania holds the Penn Relays each spring; and no champions in any event during the last decade decided to matriculate at Penn, and only two in 20 years. It is sound legislation to allow member institutions to provide awards in these circumstances. I hope that the membership will adopt this proposal.

Richard Roberts (NCAA Division I Track and Field Coaches Association): Mr. Chair, the NCAA Division I Track and Field Coaches Association unanimously supports Proposal No. 90. It is our considered opinion that the directors of such traditional and prestigious events as the Drake Relays, Penn Relays, Texas Relays and many others have never intended to circumvent the tryout rule by the presentation of awards at these events. We would further like to sincerely thank the members of the Council for recognizing the long-standing integrity of the administration of these meets and for sponsoring this legislation. Thank you.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): As a high school track coach for 13 years who participated in the Penn Relays, won many championships but never had a graduate attend Pennsylvania, I would urge you to support this legislation.

James P. Tuppeny (University of Pennsylvania): As associate athletics director of the University of Pennsylvania and director of the Penn Relays, I favor the passage of Proposal No. 90. We agree with all the statements made by Jack Reardon and Dick Roberts, and we have been making awards to secondary schools for 93 years, long before the NCAA or athletics scholarships were in operation. In addition to secondary schools, the awards we give are to elementary schools, junior high schools, middle schools, handicapped schools, colleges, Olympic development events and masters events. As Jack stated, no student-athlete selects a college because of an award he or she has won. I can vouch for this on two accounts. One, because we have five daughters who are all athletes and won several awards and never chose a college because of the awards. Secondly, I have attended 52 Penn Relays consecutively and coached and recruited for 36 years; and at no time did any of my athletes select my university because of an award they have won. The following have voted unanimously to support this proposition: the NCAA track coaches association, the NCAA Track and Field Committee, the United States Olympic staff, and The Athletic Congress. The public and press have given unanimous support to this proposal. In my last 11 months of lobbying for this proposal, I have not come across one person who has opposed it. I wish to thank the NCAA Council for sponsoring this proposal, and I do know that the committee thoroughly debates their issues.

[Proposal No. 90 (Page A-66) was approved by all divisions.]

Tryouts

President Davis: Proposal No. 91 in Division II was withdrawn.

From the Floor: We would like to have No. 91 considered as it was withdrawn originally.

President Davis: You may do so, sir.

From the Floor: I move adoption of Proposal No. 91.

[The motion was seconded.]

Edward S. Steitz (Springfield College): Those of us who have been around for 35 or 40 years recall the days when the flesh peddlers were coming on our campuses. Times have changed to be sure. Times have changed to the point now that anything you do on your campus is going to involve litigation. An athlete gets hurt coming into your institution for one of these tryouts, and you will be in court, you better believe it. Many of us recall the days when the parents were outside the gymnasiums waiting — what is the word? Did he get the scholarship? Did he get the financial aid? To me, it is a deplorable situation when we are starting to run tryouts in our great educational institutions.

Richard B. Yoder (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): Mr. President, I am a member of the Division II Steering Committee. We were sponsors of No. 92, but our membership saw fit to vote it down yesterday. One of the reasons I would like to speak against No. 91 is the concern that the Division II Steering Committee tried to add to Proposal No. 92. Please note that Item (a)-(2) required written permission. In (a)-(4), we included soccer and also prevented the use of shoulder pads and helmets in football tryouts. I speak against No. 91. As an exfootball coach, I have great concerns about what No. 91 allows; and that is the use of helmets and shoulder pads in football tryouts in particular.

Tommy J. Thomas (Valdosta State College): I would like to speak on behalf of Proposal No. 91 primarily for the minor sports of baseball, golf, tennis, and I am sure some others, where financial resources are not as large as in some of the other sports like football or basketball. Our recruiting limitations are greater. There are times when we are just not able to evaluate a boy by actual observation, and I would like to make it known that so many of the requests for tryouts are not instigated by the school itself or the coaches, but by families, the players and the coaches in high schools and junior colleges. The NAIA and the junior college tryouts go on all around us. I personally have not heard of any real problems with injuries or liabilities, or insurance causes and so forth. I think it would behoove the Convention for these minor sports to be able to satisfy these young people and their coaches. It does help, for example, to watch a young baseball prospect throw when he may not have any more games left for you to be able to evaluate him; and he comes from an area where no one can give a recommendation. I think that many, many baseball coaches and coaches of other minor sports would agree with me. Thank you.

Thomas J. Niland Jr. (Le Moyne College): Mr. Steitz and I, who have between us probably 100 years in college athletics, seldom agree; but we do agree on this. I think at the Convention in San Diego where we presented "Proposition 48," I made the statement that it was the best legislation by this organization in 25 years because it benefited the student-athlete. Now, we find ourselves in San Diego trying to pass legislation that will discredit

and take advantage of the student-athlete. Please do not pass this legislation.

[Proposal No. 91 (Page A-67) was defeated by Division II. Originally withdrawn, it then was considered.]

Financial Aid Limitation — Research Grant

Joan Cronan (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 97.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment will allow within the financial package research grants that are established. Very strict guidelines have been set to eliminate abuses. Passage of this could help our student-athletes take advantage of some outstanding career opportunities and educational opportunities. I urge your support of No. 97.

[Proposal No. 97 (Page A-71) was approved.]

Complimentary Admissions

Eugene F. Corrigan (University of Notre Dame): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council and all those who lived through last fall's purge, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 98.

[The motion was seconded.]

Very simply, this removes the current restrictions as to who may receive complimentary admissions from a student-athlete. It further allows each division to establish procedures for the administration of complimentary admissions. In short, this proposal will allow student-athletes to invite maybe a girlfriend or a neighbor to a game. I move its approval.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): Mr. President, I rise to oppose this amendment very strongly. I do not believe that we should legalize murder because we cannot necessarily always restrict the use of firearms. I realize that that is a difficult one to manage. I am a part of that. I realize the difficulty every Saturday. I realize that on occasions I had to miss the first part of a ball game. I realize some of my colleagues in my conference don't think I missed much not seeing my team this year. (Laughter) However, I am here to tell you that this is a most important piece of legislation as far as Division I is concerned. We should not have unlimited complimentary admissions. This piece of legislation, first of all, opens up the possibility, because of the ability to swap off complimentary admissions, that one particular student-athlete can have 12 or 14 complimentary admissions with no control whatsoever in any way. Now, we are back to the problem. It is a major problem. If you look at the infractions cases, and I will tell you that this is very true because I have looked at them time and time again, time and again the major infraction is with regard to the sale of either the admission or the ticket. This proposal would put us back in that business again.

Proposal No. 101, which will be proposed if this one does not pass, will address 75 percent of the problems we have had this past year, because it gives each student-athlete one wild card for that athlete only to take care of the girlfriend or the mother's boyfriend, or whoever shows up. But it does not permit us to have unlimited complimentary admissions out there to be sold on Saturday afternoon. I am telling you it is a major problem. If we do not vote this down and reestablish what we did a couple of years ago, we are back in the same business we have been in in the past. I urge you strongly to stand up and vote against No. 98, and let's approve No. 101 and maintain

the integrity of the complimentary admission program.

Mr. Corrigan: I am not going to try to respond to Roy. I want to ask a question. I thought this legislation definitely did not open it up to anything other than the same pass list controlled by the same institution where a student-athlete would have available four complimentary admissions.

President Davis: Let me respond. No. 98-A, which will be voted upon separately, removes the restrictions from the constitution and simply allows that procedures for the administration of complimentary admission programs for each division be controlled by the bylaws enacted by the Association. Then we would vote the three separate other matters for each division — B, C and D. Gene, under our current provisions, there are four complimentary admissions that can be designated only for members of the immediate family. The proposal, at least in Division I, is that those persons still have to be named, and they still are on a pass list and there are no hard tickets issued. Proposal No. 98-B, in terms of Division I, would require a pass list and no hard tickets would be issued. There still would be a limit of four complimentary admission tickets, but a student-athlete could designate any four persons to receive those complimentary admissions.

Richard B. Yoder (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I would encourage all my Division II and Division III colleagues to vote for No. 98-A, because it enables us to do what we want to do to get out from underneath all those problems we have to solve, problems we did not have.

Mr. Kramer: I think I would support Paragraph A. My remarks were for Paragraph B, and I will come back and ask for an interpretation of Paragraph B in a minute.

President Davis: Roy, if Paragraph A is adopted, that puts the administration procedures into the bylaws. If Paragraph B were to fail, then there are no procedures in Division I.

Mr. Kramer: In that case, I urge that we defeat Proposal No. 98 because we are back to the same place we have been in the past.

Mr. Corrigan: I am going to go along with old Roy. (Laughter)

L. Oval Jaynes (Colorado State University): I would like to add my support to Mr. Kramer's position. By defeating 98-A, it would allow us to consider 101.

Rudy Carvajal (California State University, Bakersfield): I would like to echo the statement by Dick Yoder. We have no one-on-one for Divisions II and III, and those that have gone through the nightmares of this last year understand that we need some help. So, therefore, I ask for support for 98-A.

Russell J. Poel (North Central College): On behalf of Division III members, I would ask your support for No. 98-A. I am not going to speak with the missionary zeal of Mr. Kramer, because the day the Division III tickets are scalped, we have got a problem. (Laughter) The fact of the matter is that there are an awful lot of Division III schools that give tickets away. In fact, they don't even use tickets; they let them walk through the gate. To make us have to have a pass list is ridiculous. We don't want to do it by way of No. 101. We would like to be able to do it by way of No. 98-D, and to do that we need your support for No. 98-A.

Homer C. Rice (Georgia Institute of Technology): I just want to report that the Division I-A directors of athletics will support No. 101, and we

hope you will defeat No. 98 because this complicates the issue. I understand the situation in Division III, but we are the ones that have the problem. The directors, after the shock last year, actually learned how to operate the system.

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): I would like to urge the support of No. 98. This proposal has been discussed extensively among Council members, probably longer than it should have been discussed. The ultimate resolution was that taking it out of the constitution would allow for each division to make its own determination of how it wanted to deal with complimentary admissions. If No. 98 is not passed, the problem in Division II and Division III, of having to use a pass list only will not be addressed. The proposal that came forward from the Division I Council members in Part B of this proposal was discussed extensively and supported. I hope that the entire delegate body will support No. 98. Thank you.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): Earlier today, I solicited the support of Divisions II and III delegates for legislation that helped resolve a problem and which was really in the best interest of Division I, trying to find a solution to one of these situations where as it stood we had to vote together. At this point, I would urge and invite and ask and plead with the delegates from Division I to support No. 98, because this is an instance where the regulations they require weigh much more heavily on Divisions II and III than, in fact, they need to weigh. Thank you.

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): As a conference commissioner who reviewed a Division I complimentary ticket list, I think it is important to point out that it is not a problem that necessarily is prevalent throughout Division I. Those conferences that believe they have complimentary ticket abuses have an opportunity to enact their own conference regulation to restrict the complimentary tickets beyond the NCAA requirement. I think it is important that the individual divisions and individual institutions can look at a program that best fits their needs and at the same time protects the integrity of the complimentary-ticket procedure.

Mr. Corrigan: In trying to help out Division II and Division III with their problems, is it conceivable that we could pass 98-A and then have a substitute motion, No. 101, and have it voted on it instead of B? You can't do that? Is there some way we can manipulate this? It seems to me there ought to be. I think everybody has the spirit in here that they want to keep tight controls on Division I-A. I feel the same way, too. I am inclined to believe that the proposal we have before us is a good solid one if there is a way we can get to it and allow Divisions II and III to have what they want.

[Note: After a lengthy discussion of parliamentary procedures, it was determined that the NCAA Council could offer an amendment to an amendment at any time. Additionally, it was determined that the Council would meet during the recess and determine if it wished to offer a substitute amendment for No. 98-B. A motion to postpone further discussion until the afternoon session was seconded and approved.]

[The session was recessed at 11:50 a.m.]

Friday Afternoon, January 9, 1987

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m., with John R. Davis chair, presiding.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Complimentary Admissions

Della Durant (Pennsylvania State University): On behalf of the Council, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 98—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Davis: Maybe I can take the prerogative of the chair to identify for you what we have done. No. 98—1 presents to you exactly what we have now for all divisions and would be applicable for Division I. That is one option. The second option is No. 98—2, which takes the elements of No. 101 and makes that available for Division I only. If those two were to fail, we are back to No. 98-B, which is a third option.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I would like to rise in opposition to Proposal No. 98—1 and urge its defeat. No. 98—2 addresses the problem that most of us had this past year and yet keeps us within the context of the meaning of complimentary admissions for family members as originally intended. I would urge you to defeat No. 98—1 and support No. 98—2 later.

Joan Cronan (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): I would like to urge your defeat of No. 98—1 and your acceptance of No. 98—2. Having been one of two institutions in the country that started this mess to start with in the fall, and we have gone through it player-by-player, name-by-name, No. 98—2 will solve about 75 percent of the problems. I would attest to you that this is a very manageable way to approach the ticket issue so that complimentary admissions will be in the hands of those that we intend them to be in to start with. By doing this, you will accomplish what we think is a manageable process.

[Proposal No. 98—1 (Page A-73) was defeated by Division I.]

Joan Cronan (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 98—2.

[The motion was seconded.]

Edward E. Bozik (University of Pittsburgh): Just a point of clarification with this new rule. What is a fellow student? Is that limited to only your institution or to any other college student?

President Davis: That is any other fellow student at a four-year collegiate institution.

Bruce A. Corrie (Bucknell University): I would just like to speak and express my concern on this. I agree with the principle of not having unlimited complimentary tickets. I think the number of four names that you can put on that pass list makes a lot of sense. My concern is that even in this proposal we are only allowing one ticket to be flexible. The others have to be either a member or relative or a fellow student. I think this is the problem we got into in the past on how to regulate that. I am very much in favor of limiting the number to four, but I would like to have complete flexibility in it. Let me just express one example. We put a lot of emphasis on the Big Brother program in which our athletes go off campus and try to work with the youth in the local community. This really prohibits one of our football players or basketball players from bringing more than one of the young people that he is working with in the community to the game, because they

are not a family member. They are not relatives and they are not fellow students of that institution. I am also concerned if you get into the divorced parents and the father wants to bring his girlfriend and the mother wants to bring her boyfriend, how do you account for them? I just express my concern that we are being too restrictive by only allowing flexibility with only one ticket.

[Proposal No. 98—2 (Page A-73) was approved by Division I.]

Complimentary Admissions — Division II

Chris Rinne (University of California, Riverside): I move adoption of Proposal No. 99.

[The motion was seconded.]

Since we are trying to clear up the problems for the various divisions administering the complimentary admission, one of the real problems in Division II is the total concept of the complimentary pass list, which is very difficult for us to administer at our various events. Signing a receipt for those tickets is going to present the same problem that we have with the complimentary list. I do not believe that Division II has a problem with the scalping of our athletes' tickets. I believe that there would not be abuse of hard tickets at the Division II level, and it would be much easier to administer that kind of a complimentary pass. Thank you.

Richard B. Yoder (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee and the Council, I speak in opposition to No. 99. We do so because we believe that putting the hard tickets in the hands of Division II athletes may lead to abuse. If we pass No. 98, we remove the burden that was experienced this past year, many of the burdens. No. 98-C permits Division II to give tickets to any person identified by the student-athlete. All they have to do is to step up to the will call, identify themselves, sign a receipt and go into the stadium or the arena. Inasmuch as No. 99 puts the tickets back in the hands of the athlete with no tracking where they may go, it appears to open up the potential for violation. Hence, we ask the Division II institutions to defeat Proposal No. 99.

[Proposal No. 99 (Page A-74) was defeated by Division II. Originally withdrawn, it later was considered.]

[Note: Proposal No. 98 was still on the floor from the morning session.]

[Proposal No. 98 (Page A-73) was approved by all divisions as amended by No. 98—2.]

Amateurism — Name or Picture

Joseph R. Geraud (University of Wyoming): I move adoption of Proposal No. 102.

[The motion was seconded.]

As indicated in the intent, this legislation is offered as a new addition to the constitution of this body. It results from the issuance of a case by the Council, which addressed the question of the manner in which institutions could utilize the names and pictures of their athletes. As the case was stated, an institution can only utilize the name or picture of its athletes in institutional publications or the sale of team or individual pictures, posters or calendars, period. Along with this interpretation, the Administrative Committee thereafter issued an interpretation, which stated that institutions are precluded from the sale of game balls in order to develop funds for the athletics departments or in the presentation of such game balls to a

charitable organization for resale or auction. Now, the question I think before the body is the extent to which legislation of this body should dictate limitations upon the manner in which an institution promotes its own athletics programs through the use of the names and pictures of its athletes; and further, whether this body wants to prevent the University of Wyoming from making a game ball available to the United Way so that we can participate in our normal charitable endeavors with the United Way. Well, the United Way didn't get a game ball this fall. The only justification I have heard is that some schools want to get out of the game ball business. I strongly feel that athletics directors, presidents and other members of the institution already have institutional policies in place with respect to how they treat charities. Now, unless this body wants to extend the football season so we can have a charitable football game later in January to assist noble causes, I would hope you would approve this legislation so that institutions can once again do what they want with regard to how it promotes its own department and how it utilizes game balls for charities.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I would urge that we defeat this piece of legislation. I think we did one of the smartest things we ever did when we put it in place originally. It has saved us all the hassle of answering these people and saying who we can say no or yes to. We can all blame the NCAA, and it is a good rule. (Laughter)

Eugene F. Corrigan (University of Notre Dame): I just want to add to what has been said. It has been very convenient to be able to blame the NCAA for this. I am sure all of us get hassled on this thing. There are still ways for people to buy balls. They don't involve the players getting into it. We think it was good legislation when it was put in. We hope that you will vote to defeat this.

Daniel G. Gibbens (University of Oklahoma): There are some good people speaking here, and they all are making sense. The input I would like to make is that this falls in the section of the book called amateurism, and the only justification for a restriction here is if there is some commercial use of the student-athlete's name or picture.

The proposal that is being offered is one that does not offend the amateur rule, does not offend amateurism in any way. As Roy and Gene have candidly stated, the only purpose of the interpretation is convenience for the athletics departments. It has nothing to do with amateurism. I urge passage of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 102 (Page A-75) was defeated.]

Permissible Expenses — Olympic Festival Tryouts

Christine H. B. Grant (University of Iowa): On behalf of the sponsors, I move adoption of Proposal No. 103.

[The motion was seconded.]

In several sports, the institution is allowed during the athletics year to fund student-athletes to tryouts leading to selection for national teams. Basketball is one of the few sports in which student-athletes cannot be funded. This proposal would permit the funding of athletes who are selected to play in the USOC-sponsored Olympic Festival tryouts, which is a steppingstone to national teams. I emphasize that future gymnasts are affected because outside student-athletes under the age of 20 may participate. It is especially for those who are economically deprived. I urge adoption of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 103 (Page A-76) was approved.]

Permissible Expenses — Serious Injury or Death

Clayne R. Jensen (Brigham Young University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 104.

[The motion was seconded.]

This seems to be essentially a noncontroversial issue. It is permissive legislation; and therefore, it doesn't require any institution to do something that it prefers not to do. Also it does not provide the opportunity for advantage or disadvantage to any institution. What it actually does is get the NCAA out of the obligation of monitoring and dealing with circumstances at institutions that involve life-threatening situations or the death of a student-athlete when these situations ought to be dealt with at the prerogative of the institutions. I urge you to support 104.

William R. Nelson (James Madison University): We had one of these tragedies at the beginning of the year, and I would like to speak in favor of this proposal. Under the circumstances, it would be very helpful for the institution to be able to provide this kind of support.

[Proposal No. 104 (Page A-76) was approved.]

Multidivision Classification

Andrew De Rocco (Dennison University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the sponsors, I move adoption of Proposal No. 105.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of No. 105 is to bring about a clarification of the multidivisional status of a number of NCAA institutions. It would have the effect of eliminating multidivision classification of sports for all Division III institutions and restrict certain Division I and Division II institutions from classifying at least their football in Division III. To the best of our knowledge, only 37 or so of the some 800 NCAA institutions would be affected. It would be 16 Division I members, seven Division II members and 14 Division III members that would be asked to reclassify their one sport that currently is operating multidivisionally. On the other hand, more than 70 other institutions that are in multidivisions, that is I to II, or II to I, would not be affected. Proposal No. 105 deals with only those multidivision institutions that operate within Division III. This, of course, will not deprive, to the best of our knowledge, any institution from the opportunity to field any sport or the opportunity to compete for an NCAA championship. With the passage of No. 105, the affected 37 schools would not be left without options. They would be free to move their programs to other divisions that retain the multidivision option or return the one sport to their present division. We, the sponsors, have set September 1, 1991, as the date of operation. Let me say this somewhat on a more personal level. I am new to your body. I have not attended a meeting of this kind before. I am virtually as new to the presidency of my university. I arrived there at the very time when Dennison University was entering into an arrangement with six other institutions to form a conference, and it was the North Coast Athletic Conference. I knew very little about the philosophy statement of Division III at that time, but it became very clear to me that the NCAA at least had a program internally that was in full consonance with that philosophical statement.

The practice and philosophy were coherent within that particular conference. I believe I understand what the philosophy statement of Division III is

about. This pertains to grants-in-aid and a variety of other circumstances, all of which are not uncommonly associated with Division I athletics. I believe that this is an appropriate behavior for Division III; and indeed, it may well be more broadly so. What No. 105 seeks to do is to remove the current dissidence that exists. While I sense among all of you some sense of reform, some mood for change, all of which would be consistent with the philosophical statement adopted in 1983 as a statement for Division III, we do not intend by this legislation to suggest that any of the 14 Division III institutions currently participating in a sport in another division are unacceptable to Division III. Quite the contrary, in fact. We stand in such admiration of each of them that we would welcome them in their entirety in Division III. We suggest that for a true Division III institution, the Division III championship should be a fully satisfying achievement and the national annual culmination of the season's effort. Division III treats its athletes in this manner. As a new president, I have come to admire and respect the philosophy of Division III; and I shall do my best to fulfill it at my institution. We believe that No. 105 is a chance now for the full membership to do the same. Thank you, sir.

John W. Kaiser [St. John's University (New York)]: Mr. Chair, I would like to suggest to the membership that they consider some other factors regarding this particular item. No. 1, the previous speaker, as he outlined to us, has come lately on the scene; so he did not take into consideration a long history in the sport of football which in many ways is unique. Certainly, it is expensive. Certainly, it is enjoyable. Certainly, there are other options but not a viable one for the small-in-number Division I and Division II institutions, I believe the proper number is 22, that currently play Division III football. In our own institution, we have had intercollegiate football since 1983. It was brought back to the scene on our campus by the student body. The first year as a club team they played one game. After being a club sport for eight years and enjoying great success and popularity, with a large group of the alumni or friends, they persuaded the university to sponsor a Division III football team. Many of the schools playing Division III football in our category have come through the same system. Furthermore, if this multidivision classification were thrown out, very few, if any, of the institutions of this class would be able to sponsor a Division I program in football, thus, disenfranchising somewhere between 1,000 and 1,500 good NCAA student-athletes. They would not be able to play football. With this in mind and also realizing that our institutions, besides providing this competition and a good wholesome atmosphere, subscribe completely to all the rules and regulations governing Division III football, I would ask your help and support to help us continue this program. Thank you.

Laing E. Kennedy (Cornell University): Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to Proposal No. 105. No. 105 affects long-standing competitive relationships in many sports. Among many schools in the Eastern states, these opportunities have been good for our students and brought together on the field and in the arena many institutions that have long affiliations in other ways. For us, this is particularly true in the ECAC Division I Hockey, which has 12 members of our Eastern Collegiate Athletic Conference Division I league plus four Division III institutions. The membership has allowed us to develop a format that reduces travel time and missed class time while maintaining a quality hockey league. We would hope that Pro-

posal No. 105 would be defeated.

Paul F. Dietzel (Samford University): As an old World War II pilot, I liken our Convention to flying hour upon hour in boredom interspersed with moments of sheer terror. This Proposal No. 105 and Proposal No. 106 are moments for terror for a lot of us. After taking part in the Division III discussions for the past two days, the best statement I heard was made by President Jim Whalen of Ithaca College who said, "Don't think of the NCAA as a bunch of fellows out in Kansas City, the NCAA is us." After 30-plus years representing Division I schools, I find myself representing a school very similar to what my alma mater was when I studied and participated in athletics.

You know, there really is not that much difference. Big is not necessarily bad. Small is not necessarily smug. But we certainly are a diverse group with diverse problems, and all of us are trying to do our best to survive. Oddly enough, an old friend and colleague from the University of Chicago told me yesterday, "This is legislation we decided upon in 1983." Fine. But this is 1987; and the scene, not surprisingly, has changed. She also told me, "We just can't let down the floodgates and allow schools like you to overrun and dilute our championships." Do facts support this fear? In the next breath in Proposal No. 115, this Convention will be asked to allow Division III champions to compete in a Division I championship. I find no fault with that idea as it smacks of fairness to the athlete, and the ultimate recipient of the thrust of our legislative acts should be student-athletes. Samford University is a small Baptist school with a most modest athletics budget. Most Baptist schools are, in a word, poor. Three years ago before I arrived, Samford's president decided that Samford should have a football team. At that time, Samford belonged to a Division I basketball conference; and with the exception of basketball, all of its coaches were part-time — would you believe at the rate of around \$4,000 a year or less. When Samford started Division III football, it hired a full-time coach and surrounded him with several part-time, \$4,000-per-year young coaches. During the past two days of Division III discussions per financial aid, it has become very apparent to me that even though we have Division I basketball, Samford strictly adheres to all Division III guidelines and philosophies in football. We have not noted any opening of the floodgates either. The first year, 1984, we won one game. In 1985, we won two; and this past year in 1986, we won three. In six or seven years, we may be tough. But Samford could not afford scholarship football. Multidivision for Samford and schools like us is the only way we can have football. Now, I ask you, are we attempting to pass legislation that will force schools like us to discontinue sports? It seems to me that the NCAA trend seems to be to the contrary. Who would be the losers? It would be quite a few fine young student-athletes who pay their own expenses to go to school and who obviously love the game of football.

Richard L. Taber (Colorado College): Division III conducted extensive discussions yesterday in the Division III roundtable and the day before in the Division III issues forum on a variety of topics. It became very clear during those discussions that among the 300 and some-odd institutions, there is tremendous diversity. Among these more than 300 institutions are 14 schools that are in Division III but play a sport in Division I. In 1983, this Association addressed the question of multidivision classification in Division III by modifying Bylaws 10-6-(a), which severely limited, indeed effec-

tively froze, the number of Division III institutions that could participate in a Division I sport. At that time, there were 22 Division III institutions playing in a Division I sport, and they were grandfathered in to allow them to continue their rich athletics tradition. That number has since decreased to 14 in 1986. They have developed their programs, continued with their plans in confidence that the NCAA meant what was said in 1983. Most of those sports are low visibility sports that are conducted for historical, traditional reasons on a regional basis in Division I. Among them are soccer, lacrosse, ice hockey, tennis and field hockey. The tradition is incredible. Each one of the 14 members has been playing Division I sports at a national level for more than 100 years. Colorado College has been playing ice hockey since 1938, helped the pioneers develop ice hockey in the NCAA and, indeed, hosted the first 10 NCAA championships. This is an incredible amount of athletics heritage and tradition, and it would be extraordinarily difficult for Colorado College and these other institutions to let that go. There is absolutely no evidence whatsoever to indicate that this Division I status for a sport brings any special competitive advantages to these 14 institutions. Indeed, out of the last 102 Division III championships conducted, only two have been won by these 14 institutions. Finally, I would invite any organization to come examine these 14 institutions to confirm that they do not have special facilities, extra resources or any extra administrative help whatsoever as a result of this Division I status. Finally, in the Manual, where the philosophical statements are made, those philosophical statements end with the statement that says, "The purpose of the NCAA is to assist its members to develop this approach as the basis for consistent, equitable competition and to do so in ways that minimize infringement on the freedom of individual institutions to determine their own special objectives and programs." I urge defeat of No. 105.

Philip S. Wilder Jr. (Hartwick College): We have 1,400 students; we have 24 varsity and junior varsity teams. We are the embodiment of Division III, except for our soccer program which has had more NCAA National Championship competitions than any institution except St. Louis. When the sponsor of this amendment says that schools affected would have a choice, it simply does not fit the facts of my little school. There is no way we could move to Division I, and closing out our Division I soccer program would jeopardize our future. It seems to me that failure to keep faith with the grandfather clause provision adopted in 1983 creates very serious questions about the ethics involved therein.

Robert M. Whitelaw (Eastern College Athletic Conference): In the capacity of commissioner for the Eastern College Athletic Conference for more than 25 years, I have not personally observed or experienced any unfair competition advantage for the very limited number of ECAC Division III colleges sponsoring the sport of ice hockey and particularly at the NCAA Division I competitive level. For over a 40-year period, these three ECAC Division III members' ice hockey programs have been eligible and entitled to compete in NCAA Division I ice hockey tournaments, if selected. Passage of Proposal No. 105 would exclude this long-standing opportunity and privilege. ECAC's diverse membership of Divisions I, II and III members over the years has attempted to offer various sports such as ice hockey and to promote institutional determination as much as possible and also the principle of encouraging maximum participation and fairness in ath-

letics competition. The ECAC requests your support in defeating Proposal No. 105.

Daniel P. Starr (Canisius College): I also speak against Proposal No. 105. The proponents of the resolution argue against multidivision classification. It seems incompatible for an institution to sponsor programs in a division with different philosophies. To me, this is no more incompatible than for an institution to sponsor different academic programs at different levels and put more of its resources in the business school than in humanities or in the liberal arts division. We all know of the ideal of broad-based excellent academics as well as athletics programs. Some institutions are noted for engineering, some with emphasis on business, some with excellent communications departments; and some with physical education, dancing and so on. Division I programs with Division III football, Division III programs with Division I hockey does not seem to be incompatible to me. We know there are Divisions I, II and III philosophies and confusions, just as there are state government constitutions for big California, middle-sized Tennessee and little old Rhode Island. But there is also a U.S. Constitution, 200 years old now, that happens to be the supreme law of the land. We also have an NCAA constitution over and above Divisions I and III philosophies, and we all subscribe to that. The NCAA constitution states under Fundamental Policy: "The competitive athletics programs of the colleges are designed to be a vital part of the educational system. A basic purpose of this Association is to maintain intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the educational program and the athlete as an integral part of the student body and, by so doing, retain a clear line of demarkation between college athletics and professional sports."

That is not incompatible with Divisions I, II or III philosophies. Further, to say that Division I members bring all the ramifications of the Division I apparatus to Division III football, I certainly disagree with. Indeed, to some extent, the reverse even takes place. It seems that the Division III football program or philosophy can impact on a Division I program. The Division I athletes sometimes become heroes on campus on a self-constructed pedestal. This tendency seems to me to be blunted by their observing of the presence of numerous Division III athletes actually enjoying the participation of Division III football. Some 80 or 90 football players participating without financial aid can have a healthy influence on some basketball players on full rides. Eighty or 90 football players not having received any aid can have a healthy effect on the student body. Eighty or 90 players who play nine or 10 games in a Division III philosophy seem to enjoy the genuine benefit of college athletics.

I would say in conclusion that if the Division III philosophy is a good thing, and I think it is, then the proponents should not want to restrict it but would want to spread the good word, to share this meaningful philosophy with others; that the Division III ideal should be disseminated so that others can share its benefits. I, therefore, urge the defeat of Proposal No. 105.

Curtis W. Blake (Drake University): Mr. Chair, supporters of this proposition have publicly stated that an institution must take either "a small time or big time approach" and that you can't do both. To imply that all athletics programs must be either big time or small time seems to me to be a bit ridiculous. Every college and university across the country must make

decisions on a regular basis that will impact the degree of support afforded their respective athletics and academic programs. It is the choice of each institution to determine the allocation of the available resources. As a result, there are most assuredly varying degrees of so-called big-time and small-time athletics. This choice of support is prevalent among all NCAA member-institutions. To believe that all Division I-AA and III schools are afforded the same degree of support in athletics and, therefore, are equal is naive indeed.

Mr. Chair, fellow delegates, I am suggesting that every college and university should have the right of institutional autonomy in determining the degree of support afforded each athletics program sponsored by the respective institution. It is a constitutional statement of the NCAA that a basic purpose of this organization is to initiate, stimulate and improve intercollegiate athletics programs for student-athletes. It is a basic purpose of the NCAA to uphold the principle of institutional control of and responsibility for all intercollegiate sports. It is, furthermore, a basic purpose of the NCAA to maintain intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the total educational experience. It is inconceivable that legislation would be passed by this body that would deny students the opportunity to compete simply because an institution has chosen not to offer athletics scholarships in that given sport. I urge your support in defeating Proposal No. 105.

Kenneth J. Weller (Central College, Iowa): I have a speech of equal length that I can deliver with similar vehemence, but I will not do so. I simply would say that I believe that the proposers of this amendment have a very fine grasp of the importance of a philosophy of an institution regarding the relationship between athletics and the academic experience. They suffer, however, I believe, in the practical problem of understanding that there are some of our institutions that have made substantial commitments to these programs; and I think we should honor those commitments. Therefore, Mr. Chair, I would urge the body not to support this amendment but to recognize that it stems from a very, very valid philosophical point of view that I think serves this Association well. Also, I move that debate cease.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

[Proposal No. 105 (Page A-77) was defeated by all divisions.]

Multidivision Classification

Armin P. Langholz (Capital University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the nine members of the Ohio Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 106.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent, as indicated, is to prohibit Division I and Division II institutions from being classified in football or other sports in Division III. Obviously, a key difference of this proposal from Proposal No. 105 is that it does not impact the 14 Division III schools that compete currently at the Division I level or other schools that want to move up to a higher level of participation. So to the concerns that our friends from Colorado College and the ECAC schools raised, this proposal does not impact on seasonal participation of Division I or Division II schools with Division III schools. Economics, history and regional interests often encourage seasonal scheduling of competition between schools regardless of division classification.

We do feel there is an affirmation here that in the philosophy of a school's program there is greater consistency with single-division classification. An

obvious area is in financial aid. One of the speakers earlier talked about athletes being disenfranchised. We get concerned, too, about those Division III athletes who compete, who succeed, who achieve excellent records, and who discover that when selections are made they are disenfranchised from participation in their own championship events because athletes from larger institutions playing in Division III are selected. So for these reasons, we solicit your support for Proposal No. 106.

Daniel P. Starr (Canisius College) I will not reiterate many of the arguments I used on No. 105. I would like to focus in on football here. I can certainly understand the concerns of the Ohio Athletic Conference institutions, which are excellent academic and athletics institutions. I say that there must be a better way. This is bad legislation, and there are alternatives. I say don't hurt those of us, cause irreparable damage to us that have football teams, that have probably 90 to 100 student-athletes on these football teams and some 2,000 totally that would be disenfranchised because of the actions of one large Division I institution that is down in Division III and has the trappings of some of these big-time schools. It seems to me that it is the old question of one bad apple spoiling the barrel or one being singled out and damaging the actions also of others. I would say this, that there are other ways to accomplish some of these things. If there is a fear about these schools in Division I playing Division III football, we should maybe restrict staff sizes, limit recruiting, prohibit guarantees for playing games and a whole number of things that could be done that would accomplish, I think, the same sort of thing.

In conclusion, I would say that it is true that on occasion one of the institutions that is Division I/III may qualify for one of the 16 slots. That is very unlikely. If you go through The NCAA News the past few years, rarely does one of the institutions in question appear in the top 20, 30, 40, 50 or 60 top schools in Division III football. For these reasons, I think that I am adamant and would like to urge the support of everybody here against Proposal 106. Thank you.

Elwood N. Shields (Northeast-Eight Conference): For all the reasons stated already, the Northeast-Eight Conference directors of athletics and its presidents unanimously urge the defeat of this proposal. At this time, Mr. President, I move that debate cease.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

[Proposal No. 106 (Page A-78) was defeated by Divisions I and II; no vote was declared in Division III, but approval of all divisions was necessary.]

Four-Sport Sponsorship Requirement

James E. Nelson (Suffolk University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the sponsors of this proposal and the 57 other members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 107.

[The motion was seconded.]

At the 79th annual Convention that convened in Nashville, Tennessee, I spoke in opposition to legislation reclassifying NCAA institutions that did not meet the minimum sports criteria sponsorship in their division. My opposition was not based on requiring minimum standards but rather that no vehicle at that time was amended to this legislation in order to provide relief for those long-standing and proud members of the NCAA who might have difficulty in achieving the sponsorship objective. At our last Conven-

tion, we successfully addressed the obvious difficulty of those institutions, documenting a disproportionate male and female student ratio by allowing a waiver of the minimum sports requirement when applicable. A not-so-simplistic dilemma for others within the Association is the inability to sponsor a sport in these particularly offered, inadequately funded areas that are not embraced by the student body due to external factors. Suffolk University is not unique in its makeup of offering intercollegiate athletics. Just as the government of Switzerland brings to the people a proud and good Navy without the benefit of an ocean, Suffolk is proud of its athletics teams, which represent their university in 11 intercollegiate sports, do so without the benefit of any university-owned facilities. As an inner-city community institution, we have documented that our incoming freshmen each year are often the first in their family to attend postsecondary education. Their concerns revolve around their academic pursuits, financial aid and work experience to finance their education. Extracurricular activities such as athletics, although a desired interest, is not a reality for a majority of these students, given the time constraints placed on their day-to-day schedule. What is apparent in speaking to these students, when we as administrators and coaches in turn recruit for prospective student-athletes, is that they as members of the university community would not wish to see jeopardized the institutional standing within the NCAA of their fellow classmates who are fortunate enough to participate in intercollegiate sports.

It is my understanding that the NCAA Council will oppose Proposal No. 107. At this time, I am not certain of the rationale. For those of us affected by what might become the ultimate penalty as a participating member, namely the deprivation of active membership within the NCAA, the issue is and will continue to be solely an athletics issue. If, in fact, certain Council members have persuaded the entire Council that passage of this legislation would leave the door open for directors of athletics to curtail the women's program to the benefit of the men's program, I, as an athletics director, resent this implication. Since the advent of Title IX legislation and the incorporation of broad-based women's programs within the NCAA, it is hoped, and I believe that this is a reality, that those administrators, both male and female, charged with the administration of intercollegiate programs have discharged their responsibilities in a manner to one for all male or female participants. On most occasions, when the Council has spoken on an issue, we believe in its judgment. However, do you not feel that at the very least we should have a petition-for-waiver process in place for an aggrieved institution? This would not be the automatic granting of the waiver upon presentation, for that will be determined by the Council itself by a two-thirds majority vote on the merits of each individual case on a yearly basis. A further safeguard is that the submitted documentation for requesting a waiver is brought forth under the aegis of the institution's chief executive officer. Student-athletes who have been honored to represent the NCAA will thank this deliberative body for allowing them the opportunity to continue in athletics under the banner of the NCAA.

Lawrence R. Schiner (Jersey City State College): I rise to speak in favor of adoption of Proposal No. 107. Lack of participation in men's and women's sports has become a major problem for many NCAA members, especially at the Division III urban institutions. It may be difficult for

many of you to understand the seriousness of this situation; but to those of us who are confronted with the problem, it is very real and very threatening. Recent changes in the sociological profile of our students have had a negative impact on our athletics programs. There was a decline in enrollment of students between the ages of 18 and 21, thereby necessitating our colleges to enroll more part-time and older students who are not candidates for participation in the athletics program. In urban public institutions, most students are from low-income families and must forego intercollegiate sports in order to work to pay for the cost of their education and in many instances to help support their families. Suburban campuses, like that of Jersey City State College, have fewer dormitories. This obviously hinders the recruitment of potential student-athletes. Additionally, many commuter students who would consider participating in athletics are discouraged by the transportation problems inherent in practices in games that take place late in the evening. These basic conditions have caused a critical reduction in the availability of candidates for maintaining the requisite number of sports for men and women. I also would like to clarify one further issue related to Proposal No. 107. Its intent has not diminished a broad-based athletics program at our colleges and universities nor cut back on the monies allocated for the sponsorship of the requisite number of sports. The schools that have proposed this legislation have funds and facilities in place but just do not have the student interest. There are at least eight metro New York-New Jersey institutions, as well as an increasing number of suburban colleges in the area, that are struggling with this problem at present and whose active membership status is in jeopardy. Therefore, I urge you to vote in favor of Proposal No. 107, so that our student-athletes will continue to have the same opportunity as your student-athletes to compete in the NCAA championships. Thank you.

Mikki Flowers (Old Dominion University): On behalf of the Council, I would like to speak against Proposal No. 107. The NCAA Council and member institutions have worked hard in recent years to ensure competitive opportunities for women athletes. Although I understand that it is not the intention of the sponsors to do so, this proposal jeopardizes the progress we have made towards the goal of maintaining and improving women's athletics across the country. Institutions need this body's continued support in developing steps in the women's athletics programs. The Council feels it would be very difficult to define insufficient student interest and encourages this body to continue to send the message of cultivation of athletics for both men and women.

Kathleen LeVache (College of New Rochelle): We are a total women's college with about 350 students. In Division III, we were No. 2 in basketball two years ago. This year we had to cancel our basketball season due to many circumstances beyond our control. I don't want to go into a list of them. We had to cancel our tennis season. We are finding it difficult to find students who are interested. We are working hard and recruiting like mad for next year and plan a program for next year. If the progress continues in the direction in which it is going, the schools in our situation will find it very difficult to field 14 and stay within the NCAA. I urge you to please pass this proposal.

G. E. Moran, Jr. (Morehead State University): On behalf of the Council, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 107. The rule relative to the sponsor-

ship of four men's sports and four women's sports is certainly a very minimal requirement. The current NCAA rules provide for means of granting exceptions to the four-sports sponsorship requirement. I urge your support in defeat of Proposition No. 107.

Joseph Barresi (College of Staten Island): Mr. President, the College of Staten Island is a Division III member and a unit of the City University of New York. In addition to the comments made by those who wished this proposal to be supported, we have a unique situation. Many of our professorial ranking professors have left the coaching area. We are forced to deal with part-time coaches. The continuity of recruiting students for our programs has been seriously jeopardized. In addition to this, we have students who have to pay their own way, compete in athletics and find a way to make it a meaningful experience for themselves. We urge that if this is not supported that we feel some 200,000 students in the six units of the City University of New York will be disenfranchised. We are not opposed to four sports per se. I can recall the excitement in 1979 going back to my institution and seeking support to increase to four women's sports. Because of the general problems we are facing, we ask you to support this legislation. Thank you.

Robert R. Peck (Williams College): Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in support of this amendment. We are one of the sponsors. We are fortunate to be in a position to sponsor 30 intercollegiate sports as well as 18 club and junior varsity teams. I think some of us in that position should have some compassion and really listen to the people that are telling us about their problems with numbers and the reasons for these numbers. I think that there are enough safeguards in this proposal — the Council, voting by a two-thirds majority, the chief executive officer having to document the problems that these institutions are facing. I have heard presentations here, at the ECAC and in our own round tables from what I think are people of high integrity who have worked hard to have the necessary sponsorship. I think we should have some faith in them and understand that they are trying to do this and they have some unfortunate circumstances. I urge the support of this proposal.

James Migli (New York Maritime College): We are in a metropolitan area fighting desperately to try to field the number of teams to meet the sponsorship requirement. However, at our institution, we have a problem. We have 48 female cadets, half of which are on our sailing team, both fall and spring season. I ask you how can I sponsor four female sports when some of them are not even recognized by the NCAA?

James E. Nelson (Suffolk University): I wish to rebut the comments regarding a waiver being in place for insufficient interest. The waiver is for disproportionate male and female participation. Let me also state that I am outraged that not even the opportunity to petition for a waiver of relief will be afforded a member institution if that institution falls below the required number of sports offerings. It is beyond my comprehension that such an august and knowledgeable body as the NCAA would not even listen to and interpret the empirical data from an institution's CEO before contemplating the abandonment of a long-standing member. The judicial system affords us the opportunity to be heard before judgment is forthcoming. Should not an affected member within the NCAA also have the same from its elected representatives?

[Proposal No. 107 (Page A-78) was defeated 336-292 (53.5 percent, but

two-thirds majority required).]

Sports Sponsorship Criteria Sanction

Dennis Golden (Duquesne University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 111, Mr. President.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, those supporting this proposal do indeed prescribe to the respective division philosophies. They diligently endeavor to abide by the rules and regulations of the Association. They place emphasis on academics, and they conduct their programs with integrity. They strive to achieve the proper balance between athletics and other institutional priorities. Additionally, Mr. President, those sponsoring this proposal realize that it is indeed important to the Association to be able to assist its member institutions when they are faced with sudden unique and unforeseen circumstances. Such assistance is vitally necessary to many member institutions, especially those of us with limited budgets who are located in urban centers and who have many of our student-athletes working their way through school both on and off campuses. Moreover and most particularly, should a member institution be faced with circumstances relating to Bylaw 10-1-(f), current NCAA legislation mandates that the only sanction that can be imposed is the most severe one possible, namely, placing an entire athletics program, both women's and men's, in an unclassified membership category for one year. Therefore, the purpose of Proposal No. 111 is to change this sanction in a manner that is both right and reasonable, namely, to place an institution on probation for one year rather than to automatically declassify the entire program. By adopting Proposal No. 111, the Association will do the following. It indeed would provide schools with the proper amount of time to ensure compliance. It would avoid unnecessary hardships and disruption in all the programs, and it would establish an environment in which schools would be more inclined to self-report, which is in keeping with the spirit of the NCAA philosophy. Finally, and most importantly of all, a "yes" vote on No. 111 would relieve the NCAA authorities from the burdensome obligation of having to impose an overly severe sanction, when the factual situations obviously do not warrant it. In view of these facts, Mr. President, I would respectfully seek the delegates' support of Proposal No. 111.

Robert H. Donaldson (Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck): Fairleigh Dickinson University is a large, private, multicampus, urban, primarily commuter institution but not a wealthy school. Therefore, we are unable to support all our teams to the limit with athletics scholarships. Last year, we had the coaches to schedule contests and budgets for more than the minimum of Division I-AA men's team. A combination of injuries and inadequate student interest caused us to fall short of the minimum contests. To try to prevent this reoccurring, I allocated more scholarships to these teams. I urge your support of this proposal.

James E. Defaney (Ohio Valley Conference): Mr. President, I rise to support Proposal No. 111. I think good policy and responsible governance require that penalties be reasonably related to the infractions. The present penalty is too broad and the effects on innocent parties is unduly and sometimes unnecessarily harsh. The penalties in effect are one-year institutional penalties, with sanctions prohibiting teams and individuals from competing in all NCAA postseason competition. Technical and unintention-

tional violations of this bylaw also result in penalties that are equal to or more severe than more recent infractions cases involving violations of recruiting or amateur standards. This is not good for the NCAA. If we want an automatic penalty for noncompliance, let's adopt this proposal, which calls for a one-year probation without postseason sanctions, I believe it will be sufficient to effectively deter violations, encourage compliance and fairly punish violators.

Daniel P. Starr (Canisius College): I echo the sentiments of the previous speakers and urge your support of No. 111. It is a matter not of mercy but just simple justice. It is again a recognition here that when criteria is set up and is not adhered to, this is a violation and penalty is necessary. I think we all agree with that. Certainly the proposal agrees with that. We have a minimum number of swimmers, eight or nine instead of 11. That is a violation. The entire program, it seems to me, should not be placed in unclassified status for one sport. I think that Proposition No. 111 corrects it. It acknowledges a violation and a need for penalty; but the penalty fits the infraction, namely probation rather than an unclassified status. I urge you to support the passage of No. 111.

[Proposal No. 111 (Page A-80) was approved by all divisions.]

Resolution: Drug Testing

President Davis: We now go to Proposal No. 114, which the chair has ruled out of order.

Harvey Schiller (Southeastern Conference): Mr. Chair, I wish to speak on the chair's decision ruling out of order Proposal No. 114. I want to correct a number of misunderstandings regarding the views of the NCAA Executive Committee and the NCAA Postseason Drug Testing Committee. The NCAA Executive Committee is responsible for the supervision of the drug-testing program and for administration of the NCAA championships. We would like to believe that the committee's record in this regard merits the confidence of the membership in applying the executive regulations pertaining to ineligibility resulting from positive drug testing. For this fall and through to the 1988 NCAA Convention, we wish to assure the membership that the automatic-qualification rights of various conferences will not be preempted. The integrity of the various national championships will be protected, and the drug-testing program will be administered in an expert even-handed manner. In this process, the Executive Committee must have the flexibility necessary to adjust to unforeseen circumstances in this evolving program. These remarks are intended to give the Convention delegates a correct appraisal of the plans of the Postseason Drug Testing Committee and the Executive Committee in enforcing the ineligibility decisions that may result from positive drug testing. In doing this, we understand that possibly some of the mistaken impressions that occurred resulted from what was submitted somewhat from public pronouncement by the NCAA Postseason Drug Testing Committee and the NCAA Executive Committee at the outset of this program. All of this was done in an effort to keep a broad range of options available to the Postseason Drug Testing Committee, including random and unannounced testing, thus reinforcing the deterrent nature of the drug-testing program. This approach, we believe, worked strongly to deter usage of drugs within intercollegiate athletics during the past several months. The result was a much lower percentage of positive tests than the committee or even the public at

large anticipated. We understand that this approach with this uncertainty raises concern among the sponsors of No. 114. The following are the summarized facts of the matter.

The NCAA Executive Committee did not adopt executive regulations pertaining to team and eligibility resulting from positive drug testing. The Executive Committee is prepared to extend the suspension of team sanctions from 1 September, 1987, through the adjournment of the 1988 Convention; except in an NCAA fall team championship, the regulations may apply if the team gains an unfair advantage through the use of players who tested positive and contributed materially to the team success. The NCAA Postseason Drug Testing Committee has not, and I repeat, not recommended the legislation of Executive Regulation 1-4-(f) as it pertains to drug testing. In fact, the absolute contrary is true. The committee does not believe that the drug-testing program can be adequately implemented if violations do not affect team eligibility. I repeat, the committee believes that it is essential that if a drug-testing program is to be effective, team ineligibility must be on the line. It is a matter of timing, and it is the committee's position that a team-ineligibility provision should be in place for the 1987-88 academic year. The NCAA executive regulations pertaining to return of team money do not apply to certified postseason football games. Let me report what the NCAA Executive Committee and the NCAA Postseason Drug Testing Committee favor.

First, they believe strongly that this Association should not endorse a double standard of eligibility rulings, one for individual NCAA championships and a far more lenient one for those NCAA team championships where substantial money is involved. We should not engrain a policy of distinction between individual and team championships into the permanent legislation of this Association. Setting aside the legal difficulties in defending such a two-standard approach and in acting upon ineligibilities, it does not seem appropriate as a matter of principle to distinguish between the College World Series on the one hand the NCAA track championships on the other.

Secondly, we believe that it is difficult to defend a distinction between a more modest ineligibility result for a user of cocaine or anabolic steroids as compared to a player who, for example, accepted free transportation from a professional sports team or signed with a professional agent. Third, we do understand that time and experience will teach us how best to accommodate the eligibility rules of the testing program. Nonetheless, this program is one of the most constructive steps this organization ever has taken. The newness of the program is such that the Postseason Drug Testing Committee recommended and the Executive Committee agreed that ineligible sanctions against teams should be suspended for the first year. We have done that. One of the reasons was that adequate drug testing facilities were not available for institutional purposes. Now, the season has changed. We believe that adequate facilities will be in place for 1987 and 1988. In fact, the Executive Committee has committed the necessary funds to subsidize such testing in advance of the 1988 Division I Men's Basketball Championship.

Please let me repeat. The NCAA Postseason Drug Testing Committee and the NCAA Executive Committee believe we must reinstate a uniform eligibility code for both team and individual's championships. The Execu-

tive Committee has already announced that during the balance of 1986 and 1987, a tournament team will not become ineligible solely as a result of the positive drug testing but simply will require ineligibility of the offending team member or members. Frankly, we thought we had made that abundantly clear by our suspension of the pertinent executive regulations until September 1, 1987. As to the fall of 1987, we believe that it is essential in a team situation, for example, soccer, volleyball or the three NCAA football championships, that if the team has on it athletes that are significant contributors to that team test positive, then the Executive Committee wants the option to rule that team ineligible.

We do not believe that an NCAA championship should be awarded when violators of the NCAA drug code have been responsible for the team's success. The overall majority percentage of the membership has done a superb job in this; there are clean teams, and they need to be protected. As to the football bowl games, the program will impact no differently upon the 1987 football bowl games than it did for 1986. We want to move this program forward with expanded laboratory facilities and clearly stated policy. We are not going to penalize teams unfairly. At the same time, the drug testing committee and the Executive Committee believe that we must continue to make this NCAA program a model for all sports organizations in this country. Also we must protect the interests of those young people who do not want to use drugs to gain an advantage. It is unfair to give a blanket exception to teams that may not have been as meticulous in pursuing a no-drug policy to reap the benefits of more conscientious institutions. At the 1988 Convention, the membership will have the opportunity to review and determine policies for the future regarding NCAA championships in 1988 and beyond.

Ade L. Sponberg (North Dakota State University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 115.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this legislation is to retain the opportunity for outstanding Divisions II and III athletes who qualify, and I emphasize qualify, in the individual sports to compete in Division I National Championships. At the special Convention in Chicago in 1973, the three-division structure of this Association was formulated, with this as a basic premise. To eliminate this opportunity would, it seems to me, be changing the rules in the middle of the game. This issue has come before the Convention on several occasions. In 1976, the concept of terminal championships went down in defeat. In 1979, it was defeated again. In 1982, the terminal championships issue was once again defeated; yet this past August, the Executive Committee on a divided vote chose to change the executive regulations to make all championships terminal. The passage of this proposal will rescind that action of the Executive Committee and retain the advancement provision of our current bylaws. I urge your support of this proposal.

Stanley J. Clark (California State University, Hayward): I would like to remind the Association that the current members of the United States Davis Cup team in doubles competition, Ken Flach and Robert Seguso, competed at a Division II institution and would have been denied the opportunity to compete in the Division I Men's Tennis Championships if they had not been allowed to advance. I urge your support of this amendment. The

second thing I would like to remind the Association of is that participation of Division II and Division III players does not, and I emphasize does not, reduce the number of Division I players invited to the Division I national tennis tournament. There are 64 single players and 32 doubles teams invited to the Division I tournament. So it has no effect on lessening opportunities for Division I competitors. Third, there is no cost to the Association. The NCAA does not pay for the individuals from Division III and Division II to attend the Division I championships. They only pay their costs when they attend their respective championships. Fourth, in June, the Men's Tennis Committee, which consists of four representatives from Division I, two from Division II and two from Division III, unanimously voted to support the right of these student-athletes from Divisions II and III to attend the Division I championships. The Intercollegiate Tennis Coaches Association urges all divisions to support Proposal No. 115.

Edward E. Bozik (University of Pittsburgh): Mr. President, I speak on behalf of the Division I Championships Committee and the Executive Committee in urging the Convention to defeat this resolution. I think it is important to know what this does not affect. It does not affect the National Collegiate Championships nor does it affect or separate from the multidivision classification discussion we had heard earlier. Student-athletes, we believe, should compete solely within their respective divisions. That is very consistent with the federated approach. Division II and Division III athletes do have an opportunity in their own championships to compete largely subsidized from Division I championship monies. Divisions II and III athletes should really not be afforded the opportunity to compete for more than one championship. They have their own. They compete in that one. Division I athletes can compete only in one division. Division II and Division III athletes competing in Division I championships do not score. That is correct. It does not affect team standing nor do they affect the number of individuals. They do not have team standing for themselves, but they could affect the team standings of Division I. Participation for Division II athletes and Division III athletes in one Division I championship has an academic effect that requires additional class time in some cases for these athletes to compete in Division I championships. Division II and Division III schools may fill up again even though they are required, in fact, to pay for the expenses. A four-year analysis for 1983 and 1986 indicated that less than one-percent of the winners in the Division I championships were from Division II or Division III. Finally, the individual student does have a choice. He has a choice to go to Division II or Division III. If he wants to come to Division I to compete in those championships, that is still his choice. Thank you.

Richard Roberts (NCAA Division I Track Coaches Association): Mr. Chair, at the risk of being slightly redundant, our NCAA Division I Track Coaches Association urges you to vote against this proposal. We have long stood for the concept of division championships being terminal in terms of NCAA championship competition. It appears to us that we have institutional differences and, therefore, have separate divisions and separate division national championships. The Division II and Division III athletes have created several problems for us in the Division I championships that cause us to oppose this legislation when there is a division championship sponsored by the NCAA in Division II or Division III. Division II and Division III

athletes who displaced Division I athletes from reaching the finals deprive that Division I athlete's institution from national television exposure possibly for their institutions and perhaps as well as the opportunity to score for their institution and receive all-American honors as well. Additionally, Divisions II and III athletes will be afforded the opportunity to compete in two NCAA championships in the same sport in the same season. This would seem to be an unfair opportunity that would not seem to be consistent with the philosophy of the NCAA championship events. It is difficult for us to understand why the Divisions II and III championships are not a good enough season ending event for these athletes. We intend no offense to Division II or Division III, but we strongly urge them and our colleagues in Division I to vote "no" on No. 115 and keep the Division I championships for Division I only.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): I don't suppose in the years I have been coming to this meeting any proposal has been as difficult for me to reach a conclusion on as this one. On the one hand, I happen at the moment to be chair of the Division II Steering Committee, which has sponsored the amendment and declaration. On the other hand, I am a member of the Executive Committee and was privy to all of the discussions and deliberations that went into its decision to rescind the opportunities for advancement by Divisions II and III athletes to Division I. Instead, I agreed not to speak on this proposal in the Division II business session yesterday, but withheld the right to speak in this session because I honestly was not certain how I felt. I struggled with this, and I thought carefully about it. Having done so, I think it would be in the best interest of this Association to defeat Proposal No. 115 and support the action of the Executive Committee.

It is true that in 1973 the rule was established, but we change lots of rules through the years as circumstances have changed. I think changing circumstances mandate consideration in this instance. I do not think that opposition to No. 115 deprives Divisions II or III athletes of championship opportunities. They have terminal championships in their divisions. On the contrary, I would think that one can argue that the emphasis upon advancement diminishes what we like to think of as terminal championships. The number of athletes who advance are small and their success rate is not great for the most part. So for all of these reasons and weighing the issues in balance, I would hope my colleagues in Division II will vote to sustain the action of the Executive Committee and vote against Proposal No. 115.

Harley W. Lewis (University of Montana): I urge the Convention to support the Executive Committee's decision and defeat this item. The Men's and Women's Track and Field Committee has discussed this a great deal, and there is support from the committee. I am not going to be redundant and repeat the arguments that have already been made with the exception of one thing. As a Men's and Women's Track and Field Committee member involved in establishing eligibility for championships, we have continually and annually struggled with Division II and Division III athletes meeting Division I criteria prior to a championship. Each year we have had to disallow several Divisions II and III athletes from participating. There is always a problem with that. I contend that the students made their choice of competitive level and enrolled in Division II or Division III institutions, and they have their national championships.

Frank Mach (College of St. Thomas (Minnesota)): I also rise to oppose this proposal. I have had Division III athletes qualify for Division I competition. I was delighted when the woman that won the Division III championship in cross country chose to rejoice in her success and not to get on a plane in the snows of New York and fly out on Sunday to compete on Monday in the sun in Phoenix. I think that it would have been very demeaning to the success she had achieved to having to go out and have the inevitable happen. I think as far as Division III is concerned, as far as I represent that division, I would encourage you also to vote against this proposition. I also move that debate cease.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

[Proposal No. 115 (Page A-84) was defeated.]

Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships

P. Laverne Sweat (Hampton University): Mr. President, on behalf of the sponsors of this proposal, I move adoption of Proposal No. 117.

[The motion was seconded.]

If we would take a look at Article II, Section 1, of the Association's constitution, a section which I feel is sometimes forgotten by the membership when we reduce sports sponsorship, eliminate championships and eliminate the opportunity for athletics excellence through many of the pieces of legislation that are proposed and passed, we would refresh our memories as to the purposes of this organization. One being to initiate, stimulate and improve intercollegiate athletics programs for student-athletes and to promote and develop educational leadership, physical fitness, sports participation as a recreational pursuit and athletics excellence. If we do not pass Proposal No. 117, which reestablishes the Men's and Women's Division II Indoor Track Championships, we would therefore, in effect be out of sync with our purpose. In 1984, the Association approved the establishment of a Division II Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships to be held in 1985. This proposal was passed by the Division II membership based on the survey of that membership, indicating sufficient sports sponsorship. At the 1985 Convention, legislation was then proposed to eliminate the Division II Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships effective immediately. This proposal passed; but due to the fact that the host institution, North Dakota State University, had begun preparing substantially for the championships and, therefore, eliminating the championship at that point would have placed an undue hardship on the university, Division II had a one-time indoor track championships, which I must say was an outstanding one.

In 1986, legislation was proposed to eliminate the indoor track championships for both Division I and Division III. These two proposals failed, and these two divisions retained their championships. If I might stop for just a moment and go back to the business session in Division II yesterday when we were trying to pass Proposal No. 64, several eloquent speakers spoke to the point that if we did not pass that proposal Division II would be a second-class citizen in terms of academic standards. I, therefore, contend that if Proposal No. 117 is not passed, we are not only second-class citizens but we are third-class citizens; because Division I has a championships and Division III has a championships and Division II does not.

I feel that the major underlying objection to this proposal is the financial one. I am not so naive as to believe that this is not an important consider-

ation. However, I feel that financial matters concerning the operation of this championships for Division II could be solved. As you know, Divisions II and III were given block-grant funding for championships. Division III's Championships Committee recommended to the Executive Committee that the institution choose which of those championships — indoor or outdoor — they wanted funded from those funds. That recommendation was approved. I contend that this could also be an option for Division II since the Division II Championships Committee did not make any recommendations to the Executive Committee in terms of indoor track. However, above all these concerns, if we would look at the essence of track and field in this country, we would find that there is considerable documentation that a number of athletes who have competed on the national, international and Olympic teams have come from Division II institutions. To name a few, we are talking about Lee Calhoun, Jimmy Lyons, Charles Foster, Billy Olsen, Howard Sissor and so forth. It is naive to believe that track and field in this country has not become a year-round sport and that indoor track championships serve as a transition for the outdoor track seasons and will continue to do so. This is recognized by the International Amateur Athletics Federation in its conduct of world championships. If we do not pass No. 117, we will not only take away the incentive that Division II track athletes have, but we also would question the support as well as the eventual development of national, international, Olympic and world championships from this division. Let's hold fast to our purpose and vote yes on No. 117.

Richard Roberts (NCAA Division Track Coaches Association): Having fought the fight as we did last year and retained the indoor championships in Division I, we can certainly understand how dear it will be to Division II, also. With our last proposal, Division II will not be moving up to Division I. We can also understand how important it is for them to have their championships, and the Division I Track Coaches Association stands in support of Division II needing and deserving its own indoor track championships.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): As a member of the Executive Committee, I rise to express the opposition of the Executive Committee to Proposal No. 117. Before I do it, I want to make two points. One, when Division II was active to set up the indoor track championships, the following year the conference of which we are a member, the Gulf South Conference, took the lead in sponsoring legislation to abolish that championships. It was our thought that it made not a great deal of sense to fund a championships that eventually served the same athletes who had opportunities to compete in championships in outdoor track. I think that was a wise action. I had hoped it would set a precedence for Division I and for Division III. It has not. I still think it was a wise action in Division II. I wish those from Division I who are willing to concur in the establishment of this championships would help us with the dollars. The sponsors point out that the estimated cost of the indoor track championships is \$92,581 for 1986-87. That is nearly \$100,000. No matter how you count it, there is a finite pool of dollars from the block grant of approximately \$1.5 million. When you are talking about committing \$100,000 to one championships, it was this that led the Executive Committee to oppose the reestablishment of the indoor track championships in Division II. The Convention should be advised that the Executive Committee at its December 8 meeting, when it reviewed the agenda for this Convention, clearly went on record, and I am quoting, "That

the Convention be advised that if the championships should be established, transportation expenses would not be provided by the Division II block grant." I urge defeat of this proposal. Thank you.

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): I would only ask our Division I colleagues that now we have opened a number of slots Division II once occupied in Division I championships to support us in our endeavors to reestablish our own championships in regard to the men's and women's indoor track.

Ms. Sweat: I would like to point out that since in your Manual there was a note giving you the cost of that Division II championship, that the Division I and Division III championships combined cost the Association \$339,270. I also think that the Executive Committee should take into consideration the fact that Division II ought to be allowed to make recommendations to it in terms of which sport the institution wants funded from that block grant. Division III has that opportunity; and therefore, I urge that we have that opportunity also.

Mr. Green: A point of clarification. The Division II Championships Committee considered that alternative to funding championships and felt that the interest of Division II was best served by the approach we adopted and not that approach.

[Proposal No. 117 (Page A-85) was approved.]

Championships Eligibility

Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): Mr. President, I move adoption of Proposal No. 118.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ms. Taylor: I move adoption of Proposal No. 118—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

As we discussed. In the event this amendment should pass, we ask that the assembly would consider extending the date to 1991 in order to allow sufficient time for the institutions to have their programs in Division III to make adjustments.

[Proposal No. 118—1 (Page A-86) was defeated by all divisions.]

[Proposal No. 118 (Page A-85) was defeated by all divisions.]

Championships Eligibility

Mary R. Barrett (University of Massachusetts, Boston): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 119 on behalf of the Division III Steering Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal should be noncontroversial. If there is sufficient sponsorship for Division II championships then that is where the Division II member-institution should compete. Division III members are different from Division II, the philosophies are different, the population of the student-athletes is different; and there seems to be no rationale for allowing Division II members to compete in Division III championships when there is sufficient common sponsorships for a Division II event. I encourage the adoption of Proposal No. 119.

[Proposal No. 119 (Page A-86) was approved by all divisions.]

Reconsideration of Four-Sport Sponsorship Requirement

Warren C. Bowlus (University of Wisconsin, Stout): Mr. Chair, I would move for reconsideration of Proposal No. 107. I voted on the prevailing side.

[The motion was seconded.]

Richard Zerneck (City College of New York): I would like all directors of athletics, all associate athletics directors in Division I and Divisions II and III please take heart. No. 107 is very important to our athletics program. In 1985-86, we had 18 intercollegiate sports with a \$100,000 budget. This year we are down to nine, due to money but also due to the lack of participation. We have been a member of the NCAA in good standing for 18 years. There is no distinguishing trend between men's and women's programs. It is both programs right down the line. We are having tremendous problems at this point. Please reconsider No. 107.

Royce N. Flippin Jr. (Massachusetts Institution of Technology): I have listened very carefully to the discussion on No. 107 over the last several minutes and last several days, and I strongly support reconsideration of No. 107. I strongly support a "yes" vote for No. 107. In the five days in this Convention, I have heard no one present a persuasive argument against No. 107, only suspicion of a waiver process. Fellow delegates, do we really think there will be an abuse of a waiver request option that must be approved by two-thirds of our own NCAA Council after initiation by an NCAA member's chief executive officer? A waiver option appears vital in this case to me, and assumption of some kind of waiver abuse does not seem enough reason to disenfranchise senior institutions and to disenfranchise hundreds of thousands of their students from NCAA opportunities that we all value. Unless you have a specific reason against the democratic opportunity of a waiver, then why not trust the waiver process and consider a "yes" or at worst an abstention for 107.

William J. Flynn (Boston College): Mr. Chair, these are changing times. These institutions have problems. They are good institutions, they are good people and I urge your vote for the amendment.

[The motion to reconsider was approved.]

Robert R. Peck (Williams College): We have only really heard people that are for this amendment with the exception of one Council member who talked about how it might eliminate some women's programs, the inference being that there is some kind of effort to not do right by the women's programs or not enough emphasis on recruitment and so forth. I don't think that is really the case. The power of the Council has been thrown against this amendment; but the reasoning for that, with the one exception that I just cited, has not really been brought to this body. I would urge that we would pass this amendment or that the Council would please tell us why this amendment should not go into effect.

Mr. Flippin: I move that debate cease.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

[Reconsideration of Proposal No. 107 (Page A-78) was defeated (406-224); 64.4 percent but a two-thirds majority was required.]

Championships Eligibility

Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): I move adoption of Proposal No. 120.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Davis: I should point out that the action of the membership to adopt No. 119 does change the intent somewhat regarding the applicability on the intent regarding the institutions classified for Division II moving into a Division III championship. So the intent is not quite accurate, but the

amendment itself is a valid amendment.

Ms. Taylor: I think in line with the votes that have just been taken on the proposals from No. 117 on, this is consistent with the direction the assembly is taking. This motion is very specific. I believe there is only one situation that currently exists that this impacts. It is a somewhat complex issue, and primarily it involves the women's lacrosse situation. In the consent package for this assembly, there was a motion that was declared out of order because it was inconsistent with our constitution and bylaws. The situation that is existing currently is a National Collegiate Championship in the sport of women's lacrosse and a Division III championship. Both are based primarily on the numbers that exist in Division III. Two years ago or three years ago when that Division III championship was established, Division II firmly supported the right of Division III people to establish that championship. What we have right now is a National Collegiate Championship in title but, in fact, a Division I Women's Lacrosse Championship.

In fact, if you go back through The NCAA News for any year, it is always referred to as the Division I Women's Lacrosse Championship. Division III is open only to Division III members by legislation passed by the assembly two years ago; and the 11 institutions in Division II that support women's lacrosse teams have, in effect, absolutely nowhere to go with their programs. It is both inappropriate and out of the competitive reach of Division II institutions to compete in Division I. That fact has been underlined by virtue of absolutely no one qualifying for the National Collegiate Championship other than Division I institutions. We are prohibited from going to Division III. What this legislation would do would be to treat the National Collegiate and the Division III Championships in much the same way as other division championships. When Division II has no opportunity for competition in its own division, it then can select and compete under the rules and all of the regulations of that competitive division. That is the relief that we ask in this legislation for the 11 institutions in Division II.

[Proposal No. 120 (Page A-87) was defeated by Divisions I and III; no vote was declared in Division II but approval of all divisions was necessary.]

Championships Eligibility

Paul F. Dietzel (Samford University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 121.

[The motion was seconded.]

As previously stated, this proposed legislation is closely linked with the same philosophy that I expressed for Proposal No. 105 and Proposal No. 106. To paraphrase a line from a very famous poem, in the battle that goes through life I ask for a field that is fair. How can it be fair to tell a student-athlete who receives no scholarship based on athletics ability, yes, you can play, but your team will never be eligible to participate in the NCAA championship simply because your school didn't sponsor football in 1983? You can never reap the fruits of honest victory. Samford's football experience is proof that no dilution of Division III championships has occurred. Therefore, how can this be fair? In the past 39 years of rubbing elbows with you and many other fine people like you, all of us striving to improve our organization, this is without any question one of the most truly unfair pieces of legislation in our voluminous NCAA Manual. Therefore, may I respectfully urge you to vote yes for Proposal No. 121.

Russell J. Poel (North Central College): I am not going to quote any poetry for you, Paul, but I would suggest if you want to play Division III football and you were not grandfathered in several years ago that you move into Division III. We have had our arguments about multidivision classification, and I think the side of compassion is on the side of those that were grandfathered in. I have listened to you describe your program. Your program sounds to me like a Division III program, except maybe for basketball. Why don't you leave the money alone and join Division III and then play Division III sports? I for one would urge my colleagues to vote against this.

Curtis W. Blake (Drake University): We will recall that similar legislation was presented in 1986 in Division I and Division II and was defeated by a swing of, I believe, only 16 votes at the Division III level. Support of the concept of multidivision classification was clearly demonstrated by the membership in defeating Proposal Nos. 105 and 106. This legislation will provide the opportunity for all student-athletes involved in Division III football to dream of and work for the ultimate goal of all NCAA student-athletes, participation in the NCAA championships. I urge your support in passing Proposal No. 121.

Donald M. Russell (Wesleyan University): I wish to speak in opposition to this proposition primarily based on experience, that experience being a part of the grandfathering of the Division I schools into the Division III championships, of trying to protect the Division III schools that have been in Division I over a period of years through tradition but establishing a principle four or five years ago that we were going to try and freeze this multidivision classification. I don't think that today's votes were an endorsement of multidivision classification as a new policy in the NCAA. All they did was freeze things where they are. In fact, in upholding the Executive Committee on No. 115, we have eliminated multidivision competition today, which was endorsed by Division III.

I just wish to point out that you can develop a football program, or any other program, you can have it without national championships. We have a 105-year old football program, we don't compete in the national championships, and we don't have any problem getting players. We don't have any problem getting a schedule. In fact, in other sports, too, we play Division I schools that have Division III programs, including St. John's University (New York) and Iona College; and we play five Division II schools in varsity ice hockey and four Division I schools. Now, those nine schools can't compete in the Division III Ice Hockey Championships, but they have good Division III programs. We will play them as long as they have them. I think it is a red herring that you have to be able to compete in a division championship to have a sport in that division on a competitive level for the kids you want to take care of.

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): I, too, speak in opposition of this proposal. There are 202 football-playing institutions in Division III that are vying currently for 16 spots in the Division III Football Championship. The 16-team championship currently is approved only on a trial basis. Up until two years ago, there were only eight spots available; and the Division III Championships Committee is reviewing whether or not this format will continue. Four years ago, we grandfathered in those Division I and Division II institutions that were playing Division III foot-

ball. To increase that number takes away championship opportunities from Division III programs that are seeking an opportunity to play with other institutions consistent in their funding and philosophy for all programs on their campuses. I urge defeat of this proposal. Thank you.

Frank Mach (College of St. Thomas (Minnesota)): All I want to do is to remind my colleagues again in Division III, as I have throughout the last two or three days, that the voting in this kind of legislation is, in fact, to vote against our philosophy, which says we believe in maximizing participation. I can go either way; but if I am going to go vote no, change the philosophy first. Let's quit putting bandaids on what is a pretty good basic philosophy to operate under and accept what we have in Division III, a great division whose great strength is largely in diversity. I urge a vote in favor of No. 121.

Andrew De Rocco (North Coast Athletic Conference): My colleges in the North Coast Athletic Conference have some interesting statistics. Since we have included multidivision classification divisions, at least 41 percent of all schools ranked and all those that are involved in championships represent the 22 schools that have moved down. That tells you something. No. 2, the persistence in this issue that keeps coming up, tells you something. I will be frank with the membership. We are a little bit incensed that schools with a basketball program will invest large money and then tell their athletes that they can play Division III football, which is a costly program. I sympathize with those who were grandfathered in, but I would like to oppose this motion on the basis that again if they want to play Division III, come on down, you are welcome to do so.

Mr. Dietzel: With due respect to the colleague who said that we should move our program here or move our program there, I really think one of the major things in our Association is that you kind of have to live where you are and you have to decide what you can afford and what you should do. That is exactly why I think the multidivision thing is so important. I still say just exactly how do you tell an athlete that it is true he can compete and we can get a schedule. It seems to be strange to me that you can tell an athlete he is not getting a scholarship, he is playing because he really likes to play the game but we are not like the other Division III schools because we cannot be eligible for the national championship. I really think that is a very unfair thing. I can't really figure out exactly how to tell an athlete that. That is very important to an athlete.

Michael T. Bowers (University of California, Santa Barbara): I would like to speak in favor of this particular amendment. In 1971, my institution found it necessary for financial reasons to drop its Division I football program. We have maintained a Division I status in the rest of our programs since that time as a member of the Pacific Coast Athletic Conference. Five years ago, a renewed interest in football was shown by the students on our campus who held sort of an intrasquad scrimmage between north and south parts of the state. A couple of years after that, the interest got high enough that the students themselves voted to tax themselves a few dollars a year each to provide the necessary monies to buy uniforms, et cetera, so they could hold a club program. Subsequent to that time, they have petitioned the administration for an opportunity to move that club program to Division III status. That is currently where we are. We have been Division III for one year, and I might add in sympathy with my colleague at Samford

that we also had a losing program this year. So, the problem I have with the opposition to this legislation is that the arguments I hear are exclusionary. They want to keep people out. They don't want to provide opportunities for programs such as ours that evolve in a natural way and belong in Division III in football. I hope some day we will have the right and opportunity to play in the national championships and that the membership will support it.

From the Floor: I would like to remind my cohorts in Division III that one of the reasons why I speak against this is because of the amount of student services that some of the Division I schools have that we are not able to have. If you think recruiting at a Division I school that plays Division III football will be the same as recruiting at a Division III school, you are deadly wrong. Mr. Dietzel, I do have a lot of compassion for you because your system sounds much like a Division III program. Many of your cohorts that are Division I programs with Division III aspirations for football are not like you; and therefore, with their student services that are available, they have student-athletes that we do not have. So I speak against the motion.

[Proposal No. 121 (Page A-88) was defeated by all divisions after a motion to cease debate was approved.]

Limitations on Numbers of Contests

Mikki Flowers (Old Dominion University): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 123.

[The motion was seconded.]

I should make the note that there currently is being conducted a comprehensive survey to gather data in order to formulate legislation in the playing and practice area. Although this was not ready for the Convention, the committee conducting the survey felt the time had come to make a move toward tightening up the number of games played in a season by eliminating the exemptions once during any four years to disadvantaged institutions located in Hawaii, Alaska and Puerto Rico. The limitation does not apply to the regular-season conference contacts between two members of the same conference. In addition, in an effort to permit member institutions located in Hawaii, Alaska and Puerto Rico to have the maximum opportunity to schedule nonconference regular-season contests, the exempted number allowed on single trips would be increased from one contest to four contests. Please note that the 1987-88 contests, prior to the publication of the Official Convention Notice, would be exempted from this amendment. It is not the intention of our committee to place any hardship on any one special-interest group. We make this recommendation after having taken these several groups' concerns into consideration. However, we recognize the need for the limitation. We have been charged with that responsibility, and this is one attempt to get right to it.

Ronald J. Petro (University of Alaska, Anchorage): Mr. Chair, I move to refer Proposal No. 123 back to the Special Council Subcommittee to Review Playing Seasons.

[The motion was seconded.]

There is much confusion over the proposal. It deals with special exemptions for in-season play as well as tournament play. Since there are four amendments to this proposal, which will further cloud it, I would like to give you some reasons why I believe this amendment should go back to the

committee. First of all, the presidents' report does not deal with No. 123. It was not among those to be deferred. I am assuming that the presidents did not have a strong feeling concerning the legislation as it was discussed. Many of the other proposals on playing seasons have been referred back to the committee for discussion. There seems to be no presidential opposition. I would assume that the Commission would not mind it being placed back in the committee. Secondly, there is a serious legal concern with contractual arrangements already in place for the tournaments. I know the Great Alaska Shoot-out and the Hawaii schools have their contracts in order through 1990. Advice from our legal counsel indicates that the legislation will supersede existing contracts that go beyond the 1987-88 season. If passed, this would create a chaotic situation with contractual arrangements. Third, these tournaments are extra-game experiences that have been good for college basketball. These tournaments, for the most part, are during vacation periods; and there is a minimum of missed classes involved for the participating student-athlete.

President Davis: Will you confine your remarks to the question of whether it should be referred. You should not be discussing the merits of the amendment.

Mr. Petro: I think the reason it should be referred is that we have had no input from the schools in Alaska or Hawaii, and I think that is important because not having our Greater Alaska Shoot-out could undermine our entire athletics program at the University of Alaska, Anchorage.

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): I originally rose to introduce one of the amendments, but I would like to speak against referral. I do not believe that the issues are that complicated at this point, and I would urge the Convention to move on with this and other business.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I would urge the Convention not to refer this. It is an excellent piece of legislation long overdue, and I urge we vote on it at this Convention.

[Proposal No. 123 (Page A-90) was remanded by all divisions to the Special Council Subcommittee to Review Playing Seasons.]

Limitations on Numbers of Contests

Clayne R. Jensen (Brigham Young University): On behalf of the Council and the Subcommittee on Playing Seasons, I move adoption of Proposal No. 124.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 124 pertains to the Hawaii, Alaska and Puerto Rico exemption. It involves a small modification of the present legislation; the modification being that the exemption would apply only in the case of contests against or under the sponsorship of active NCAA members. The modification will help to eliminate the proliferation and lack of focus that has developed relative to this exemption provision. The intent of the original legislation was to enable active member institutions in these outlying areas to meet the sports sponsorship and scheduling requirements of the NCAA. Proposal No. 124 will bring the practice of the Hawaii, Alaska and Puerto Rico exception back in line with the original intent of the legislation and will help correct the proliferation that has developed. I urge your support of Proposal No. 124. I should point out that if this proposal does pass that the 1987-88 contests scheduled prior to the distribution of the 1987 Convention Official Notice would be exempt from this proposal. Otherwise, the pro-

posals carries an August 1, 1987, effective date.

[Proposal No. 124 (Page A-81) was approved by all divisions.]

Limitations on Football Contests

Richard B. Yoder (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 125.

[The motion was seconded.]

Last year's Convention adopted a proposal from the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association and the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference that would have permitted two Division II conferences to play a conference championship football contest. I would like to point out that in all the country this amendment only affects these two conferences. This Convention overwhelmingly voted last year in favor of our proposal. We thank you for that support. However, it was later ruled by the Executive Committee that an additional amendment would be necessary to complete our task. Hence, we return to this body with the support of the Council and the support of the Postseason Football Committee with Proposal No. 125 requesting your support one more time.

[Proposal No. 125 (Page A-91) was approved by all divisions.]

Foreign Basketball Tours

Douglas W. Weaver (Michigan State University): On behalf of the sponsors, I move adoption of Proposal No. 126.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 126 reduces the allowable overseas contests in basketball from 20 to 10. There is, of course, nothing exact or magic in numbers 20 or 10. They are arbitrary to be sure. However, 20 basketball games represents almost an entire basketball season and gives a great competitive advantage for a cultural exchange.

[Proposal No. 126 (Page A-92) was approved by all divisions.]

Limitations on Numbers of Contests

Lonnie D. Kliever (Southern Methodist University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 129.

[The motion was seconded.]

I apologize for the cosponsors of Proposal No. 129 for arriving too late to put the amendment in motion at the Division I-A Session. Our support for this proposal to exempt participants in the Mirage Bowl from the 11-game limit in the sport of football in order to give this remarkable experience to 250 of our students and student-athletes by being afforded the opportunity to participate in the Mirage Bowl. The effect of this proposal will afford greater flexibility to the sponsors of the Mirage Bowl in scheduling opponents from different conferences and diverse parts of the nation for this particular contest. The limitation to frequency of participation minimizes the time and the extension of the season.

[Proposal No. 129 (Page A-93) was defeated by Division I-A only, after not being moved in its regular sequence.]

Reconsideration of Letter of Intent — Women's Basketball

Betty Miles (Drake University): I move reconsideration of Proposal No. 77-A.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, in the interest of fairness, consistency and equality, I think it is important to reconsider this issue. Additionally, it forces a differ-

entiation between our men's and women's programs that is contrary to our history in the NCAA. I simply urge Division I to defeat this proposal.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 77 (Page A-60) was defeated.]

Reconsideration of Basketball Coaching Staff

C. Donald Cook (University of Hartford): Mr. President, yesterday I was on the prevailing side with a yes vote on Proposal No. 136. I wish, therefore, to move for reconsideration of this proposal by Division I.

[The motion was seconded.]

I believe that there is a serious need to reconsider the vote because of the impact this will have on the livelihood of many of our employees. In addition, Mr. President, there were many serious technical implications such as the effective date; the contracts, whether they were written or oral, and other considerations. For those reasons and many others, I am requesting reconsideration of Proposal No. 136.

President Davis: Perhaps it would help the Convention if I indicated at this time that the interpretation of the Council that was requested in the Division I business session. After the adoption of Proposal No. 136, after the Division I business session, the NCAA Council met and confirmed previous interpretations concerning existing contracts. Accordingly, the Council has determined that Division I member institutions cannot employ a part-time assistant coach in addition to the head coach and two full-time assistants in the sport of basketball beyond August 1, 1987, unless the institution has in effect prior to the adjournment of this Convention a written obligation to the part-time assistants, through academic tenure an enforceable contract or a formal security of employment commitment. Those commitments that are not in writing must be terminated August 1, 1987. Further, an existing written contract would not be renewed beyond its expiration or after August 1, 1987.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): Mr. President, I urge the Convention not to reconsider this issue. We debated it in full yesterday. It has stood on its merits. It does not deserve to be reconsidered on the basis of a few technicalities by certain institutions. I urge that we not reconsider it.

Mary Harshman (National Association of Basketball Coaches): I think one of the things that the membership fails to recognize is that if you delete the means of keeping your basketball programs at the highest level, you also defeat the possibility of having the same type of funding that your Association has enjoyed over the past years. I think most of you know that 75 or 80 percent of the income comes through basketball tournament funding. That isn't the point. The point to me is that you are opening the door to utilize volunteer people who are not necessarily as qualified. It seems to me that a wise trade-off would be to maintain the part-time coach, utilize him in full capacity within the department and do away with volunteer and graduate assistants who can really not offer the help that most of the coaches would like to have.

Edward E. Bozik (University of Pittsburgh): Mr. President, I rise to support the motion to reconsider. I would offer the argument that based on the interpretations from the Council that we are building in an inequity for schools for these coaches, for those who are already on long-term contracts that are going to be permitted to keep the part-time assistants. Those who have one-year contracts or oral commitments or no contracts, by the interpretation provided to us, are going to be left in a situation at a competitive

disadvantage.

John W. Kaiser (St. John's University (New York)): I would like to urge you in the most strongest terms to support this situation. We are talking about human beings. We are talking about jobs. We are talking about people who have done a good job. The only reason given on the floor to pass this yesterday was that there were abuses. It is obvious that these same abuses happen with volunteer and graduate assistant coaches. Please support the motion.

Henry C. Raymonds (Marquette University): Mr. President, I would like to rise in support of the motion of reconsidering this proposal. There are a lot of fine young basketball coaches who never get an opportunity to coach on a Division I level. We have one now who was a part-time coach at another university last year and who would not have had that opportunity. Money is not the problem here. You only can pay a part-time assistant so much. Also, the young man or the young woman is limited in what they can do. With the amount of money we just took in, \$163 million contract, it is amazing that we are going to quibble over something like this. Let's not kill the goose that laid the golden egg.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): Just so that everyone knows it, our part-time assistant has a long-term contract. I am not addressing this issue out of personal interest. However, yesterday during the segment of the Convention dealing with Proposal Nos. 135, 136 and 137, there was a great deal of confusion. I do believe that we need to bring this back for reconsideration. I also want to point out that the Presidents Commission had originally requested that this be withdrawn. I also would like to point out that it can be dealt with in June in an orderly, timely fashion with all other considerations at that Convention. Therefore, I would ask you to have it reconsidered at this time.

[Reconsideration of Proposal No. 136 (Page A-97) was defeated by Division I after a successful motion to cease debate.]

Interim Actions

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 139.

[The motion was seconded.]

As I read this over the last couple of days, I didn't know why this was not in the consent package. There are a number of waiver and exemption procedures that have to be acted upon by the Council, which it customarily has delegated to the Administrative Committee during the periods between Council meetings. There are a number of similar processes involving the Executive Committee. These really take a great deal of time in deliberations and discussions of the Administrative Committee; and the fact of the matter is almost invariably where they are routine and do not involve controversy and where there is no question of interpretation or application, the Administrative Committee routinely accepts the staff recommendation. This proposal simply permits the Administrative Committee to authorize the executive director to act on those routine requests and recommendations without review by the Administrative Committee. Again, if they are controversial and questions of interpretation or application, they will be reviewed by the committee.

[Proposal No. 139 (Page A-99) was approved.]

Infractions Appeals

Jeffrey H. Potter (Duke University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 140.

[The motion was seconded.]

There are several reasons to support No. 140, which would establish subcommittees of the NCAA Council to serve as hearing boards for infractions appeals so that a member institution's appeal would be considered by Council members from the same division as the appealing institution. One, this approach is in line with the federated approach to divisional issues, which the NCAA membership has adopted. Two, as a principle of equity, an institution is entitled to be judged by its own divisional peers; and therefore, the use of a small subcommittee to hear infractions appeals, the exact number could be determined by the NCAA Council, is a much more manageable and sensible idea than having all 46 Council members consider each infractions appeal. For these reasons, Duke University, which I represent, is persuaded there is merit to this legislation; and we would urge all member institutions to vote in its favor.

[Proposal No. 140 (Page A-100) was approved.]

Infractions Appeals

Jeffrey H. Potter (Duke University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 141.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is another sensible proposal regarding infractions appeals. The change in procedure in this proposal would be to allow an institution a reasonable time for an oral presentation in connection with its infractions appeal to the Council, rather than the current 15-minute limitation. The length of time would be determined by the chair of the Council's appeal board. We again urge the approval of this piece of legislation.

[Proposal No. 141 (Page A-101) was approved.]

Interpretations

Jack A. Friedenthal (Stanford University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 142.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Friedenthal: I move adoption of Proposal No. 142—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This one will be fun, ladies and gentlemen; and I hate, given all that has gone before, to impose a lawyer on you. I will try to do my best to keep it short. No. 142—I simply clarifies the original language of 142 in two ways. I would ask that we get on with the amendment in order to debate the real substance of the motion. No. 142—1 makes it clear that in the case of a conflict, which becomes important, the conflict is determined by the Council. Some members of the Council were concerned that we were turning the matter over to the courts if we didn't say that, and for God's sake we don't want to do that. Otherwise, people will think I am up here trying to drum up business for my brother. In (b) is a clarification to make it precisely clear what we were talking about, that violations of interpretations made after the interpretation had been made and circulated but before a new Manual has been promulgated, will be subject to violation and punishment. But thereafter, after a new Manual has come out and the interpretation doesn't appear, it will not be subject to a penalty. So I want to clear that up, and

then I will speak to the proposal in its clearer sense.

[Proposal No. 142—1 (Page A-102) was approved.]

Mr. Fridenthal: What we have here is a proposal to deal with the problem of interpretations that have caught us all at one time or another. You know, somebody said, "Gee, you don't want to stop interpretations. Most of the interpretations that are made and published in the Manual are favorable." Well, let's hope so, because this doesn't touch them. What this does is talk about those interpretations that are made and can come up and grab you. Let's say five years ago they published something in the book. We lose the scrap of paper. Everybody forgot about it. We went out and did something that the book says; and then they said, "Oh, the book is wrong; the book is wrong. You violated the rule." I thought that can't really happen. You can't have something that is long since lost and forgotten. Then last September, we got caught along with about 45 other institutions. It seems that we read the book, the Manual. We looked in the Manual, and it said that you can recruit in basketball, that is, you can make contact from September 1st to October 10th. We made contact from September 1st to October 10th and somebody said, "Oh, you didn't know back there on October 22, 1985, after the last period was just over, an interpretation came out that said white is not white. It is green. It says you can't use that period to evaluate basketball players who have a fall term."

Well, we looked it up; we had lost the scrap of paper. Of course, 45 other schools lost the scrap of paper. A mother of one of the students being recruited called up and asked the NCAA what the rules were; and they had lost the scrap of paper, too. They gave her the wrong rule. They said, "Oh, yes, they can come see her but wait until you are released." They didn't say that you can't talk to any of those people. So, you know, you call the NCAA and say that we have got something wrong here. What was their reaction? This is back in September, mind you; a whole year has gone by, and nothing has been published, nothing in the book.

What do you find? Well, my goodness, you find that they republish it on September 16th. Then on September 16th, having republished it and got a lot of flack from a lot of schools, they say they are not going to punish you. Then they come along and they say, "Well, gee, you don't really need this regulation because we don't punish anybody." I will tell you who got punished were those people that read the republication on September 16th and didn't see those kids because they are still involved. They think the rule still applied. Do you know that rule has not been changed yet? Do you know that next year you will go in, you will follow the Manual and that scrap of paper is good because interpretations are not good for a day or a year, they are good forever. They laughed. What this proposal does — and I am sorry to take so long — but what this proposal really does is to put a sunset law on this. What it says is that after the new book comes out you can throw away all those scraps of paper you keep for a year. You keep them between the books and throw them away and start fresh again. If it is important enough to punish people, it ought to be in the book don't you think? If they are not going to put it in the book; and they are really desperate because they can't get it in because it is too thick, all they have to do is to at the same time give a new book or put it in The NCAA News so we will not be caught with an absurd, obscure regulation that somebody thought up five years ago. It also happens to allow another procedure in No. 3 that says if we don't like it, we

can circulate — I don't want to call it a petition — I want to call it a demand. It says the damn thing is no damn good because the particular regulation that I was talking about was no damn good. It prevented you from going out and seeing a woman basketball player; and I think because this happened to be women's basketball players, it got a lot more attention than it would if young men had been involved in it. You said you couldn't see them between September 1st and the time their school began. It wasn't even within the policy. It was stupid. Now, of course, none of us did anything about it because we forgot about that scrap of paper that didn't have any force for 10½ months and wasn't in the book. So I urge you to adopt this. It is not going to hurt a damn thing. It is going to allow us all to have a paper in our hands that we can rely upon. Thank you.

Albert M. Witte (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): I came up to this microphone prepared to ask the Convention on behalf of the Council to oppose No. 142. I did not know there was so much pleasure (laughter) in asking for interpretations. I have never done that. I didn't know what I had missed, obviously. (Laughter) I think that while we are all under the spell of the sponsor's advocacy, we should read No. 142. He used the word "clarify." I think it still needs some clarification. If you look at Paragraph (b)-(1) in the black letters, if you read that paragraph, there are either three or four types of interpretations now being created; it is definitely three, maybe four. The three that are created are interpretations that directly contradict or conflict. Then there is an interpretation that indirectly contradicts or conflicts. Then there are interpretations that directly contradict or conflict, but they all fall under the "unless" clause. Now, there are two other statements in the Manual that contradict each other. I would like to think there are interpretations that don't fall under any of these. That would make four. I don't want to be the one that has to classify which of the four categories an interpretation belongs in. The Council will be asked to do that.

I don't know what the standard would be. I don't know what the difference is between the direct conflict and the indirect conflict. I don't think anyone else does either. Now, if there is a problem with the interpretation process, and some friends of mine here have told me there is, I don't think this is the cure. Number two, it seems to me that No. 142 creates a kind of violation of the free zone. If it is not in the Manual in the precise facts and if there is one section different, you are free. I don't know how you could administer such a thing either in the enforcement and compliance area or the interpretation area. I think this would create an administrative nightmare. I notice that the sponsor sluffed off Paragraph No. 3 by saying or summarizing it as being merely welcome and it is not important, or something to that effect. That is not the way I read No. 3. I read No. 3 as being incomprehensible.

Michael T. Bowers (University of California, Santa Barbara): Those two are tough acts to follow. It was my job, I think by pure chance and maybe our commissioner knows more than I do, to interpret this particular amendment to the members of our council in our conference. I guess what I would say is that those of you that understand No. 3, go ahead and vote for this amendment; and those that don't I would suggest that you vote against it.

William R. Nelson (James Madison University): I would like to say, first of all, as a lawyer, this is exactly the type of legislation that I would propose

if I wanted to obviate and make it impossible to carry out the enforcement functions of the NCAA. I rise in opposition to the amendment. I would say that it creates a lot more confusion and difficulty than already exists and really does not provide any help at all in the interpretation of what the Manual means.

Raymond M. Burse (Kentucky State University): I thought I went to a pretty good law school that taught me the ability to interpret just about anything. I was absolutely convinced I probably understood what No. 142 was when I got to this Convention. I am even more confused after what I just heard. If there is anything that would cripple this Association any more, No. 142 probably lands right at the top. For the last year, this Association has been involved in a rules simplification process, supposedly simplification. If there is a proposal that has been proposed at this Convention that flies in the face of simplification, this is it. If you will notice, the amendment clarifies Paragraph (1), Paragraph (2), but it doesn't touch Paragraph (3) because I don't think it is capable of being clarified. I would urge all of you to vote against it.

[Proposal No. 142 (Page A-101) was defeated as amended by No. 142—1.]

Resolution: Interpretative Process

James E. Delaney (Ohio Valley Athletic Conference): I would like to withdraw Proposal No. 143 and move adoption of Proposal No. 143—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

It is a short statement that simply urges the Council to prepare legislation for the presentation to the 1988 Convention that would put in place enabling legislation in each constitutional and bylaw provision, that would permit the Council to provide exceptions based on common-sense equity when interpreting bylaws and constitution provisions between Conventions. It has two main purposes. One is to provide flexibility and equity, and common-sense solutions to the interpretation process. The second element is to aid in the simplification functions of the Association's legislative process.

[Proposal No. 143—1 (Page A-104) was approved.]

Postseason Football Contests

George S. King, Jr. (Purdue University): On behalf of the Postseason Football Committee, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 144.

[The motion was seconded.]

I don't plan to say very much about it. I think the intent pretty well defines it except to say to you that our committee believes that this proposal will, in fact, maximize the dollars to the competing institutions and does have the endorsement of the bowls' management.

Jeremy N. Foley (University of Florida): I spent a lot of time, and started out in this business, in the ticket business; and I know a little bit about it. I feel this proposal puts an unfair burden on the school. It is very difficult sometimes to anticipate what your sales are going to be; and with bowl tickets costing \$20 to \$25 a shot, it could really hinder the schools. I urge you to defeat this proposal. Thank you.

B. Boyd Benjamin (Barry University): Mr. President, I happen to be a member of the Orange Bowl Committee and was president of it about 20 years ago. I stand in support of No. 144 because of the fact that most of the

major bowls and, as a matter of fact, most all of the bowls really, are on the sites of professional football teams that makes the selling of tickets very, very difficult. The fact that over 60 percent of the tickets that are sold in bowls are sold on the local level, it is almost imperative that we in the bowl business have as much time as is humanly possible to move these tickets. If we don't, if the tickets are returned to us within 10 days of the date of the game, we are totally destroyed in our ability to sell those tickets on the local level. I have had a great deal of experience in this, and I know exactly what I am talking about in this instance. If we can't sell those tickets, the seats are empty; and 75 percent of the loss goes to competing institutions.

[Proposal No. 144 (Page A-104) was approved by all divisions.]

Eligibility

President Davis: Please bear with me on Proposal No. 145. Because of a clerical error in the preparation of the Convention Program, Proposal No. 145 was listed as being an issue available to all divisions as a divided bylaw. Actually, the proposers of the proposition desired that it be presented as one for consideration by Division I only. Thus, Proposal No. 145 was presented as an amendment for consideration by Division I and that division defeated it in its meeting yesterday. But in order to be fair to those in Divisions II and III who thought they would be entitled to vote on No. 145, this proposal is now available to be considered in this general business session, if anyone so desires.

Gene Bleymaier (Boise State University): On behalf of the Big Sky Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 145.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 145 will accomplish three very important objectives. First and foremost, graduation rates will increase because more student-athletes will finish their education by staying in school and competing during their fifth year. This rule will bring our satisfactory-progress rules, which require 12 hours per term, in line with our participation rule. Currently, we now allow student-athletes five years to play four. This would simply allow five years to play five. An NCAA study found that only 41 percent of all male students had graduated after five years, not four years but five. This would not preclude students from graduating in four years or three years, which many student-athletes do currently.

Secondly, Proposal No. 145 will save all of us money without cutting scholarships and without eliminating sports. We will be able to save 20 percent of our recruiting budgets because we will now not be recruiting as many student-athletes each year. Thirdly, this proposal will basically solve the freshman-eligibility issue, which is really a money issue. Many presidents would like freshmen to be ineligible, but many of our coaches explain that they could not compete if 25 percent of their teams were eliminated. With five years of eligibility, the coaches would have the fifth-year students to draw from and the fact that there are the fifth-year students in the program would mean that very few freshmen would ever play. Some critics say this would be looked upon as exploiting the student-athletes. We would be using them for another year, and this would be sending the wrong message and it just doesn't look good. I have to say to this Convention that I feel the real exploitation, if there is any, of student-athletes is occurring now. We use athletes for four years and then let them go well before they are ready to graduate. We redshirt student-athletes for our benefit depriving

them of the opportunity to compete for an entire year. While this proposal may not look good, I had hoped the membership would have concern enough to do what is good for student-athletes. I don't think drug testing looks very good either, but we do it because it is important and it is good for the student-athlete.

[Proposal No. 145 (Page A-106) was defeated by Divisions II and III after a successful motion to cease debate.]

Seasons of Competition

Richard B. Yoder (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the ECAC, I move adoption of Proposal No. 146.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to specify that a student shall qualify for an additional year of competition in a sport under the terms of the hardship exception only on the basis of games and scrimmages completed during the traditional or NCAA championship playing season in that sport. The sponsors of this legislation believe it is clear to all of us that the hardship exception has always been intended to provide an athlete the opportunity to recover the season of competition in a sport when illness or injury has curtailed that season within given limits. In the application of those limits, however, especially to the athletes in the sports such as baseball, soccer and field hockey, to name a few, we have found that while the student's injury incapacitated him or her from competition during the regular traditional playing season of the sport, the student was denied the opportunity to recover that season under the hardship exception because the limitations were exceeded by the inclusion of games or scrimmages completed during the off season, even if the student did not play during the off season. Let me give you an example. A soccer player, who is incapacitated by injury in the first game of the traditional season but who recovers from the injury over the winter, is denied the hardship exception if his institution has scheduled and completed several informal scrimmages in the spring even if the player never participated in those spring scrimmages. If the player was not incapacitated for the entire soccer season, he does not qualify for the hardship exception. The same scenario can be stated for the student in field hockey where off-season formal scrimmages occur in the spring or in lacrosse or baseball where baseball off-season scrimmage occurs in the fall. For those reasons, we believe that participation limits on the hardship exception should be calculated only on the basis of traditional season of the sport. On behalf of the nearly 100 member presidents of the ECAC, we urge your support of Proposal No. 146.

Jack W. Sawyer (Wake Forest University): I should call attention, for example, in baseball, a person under this proposal could play all 20 of the fall games and 12 of the 60 spring games, a total of 32 out of 80 games, and still have an extra season for another 80 games left over.

Mr. Yoder: That is true if you had a formal fall baseball season. Most of our fall baseball is quite informal. I know that at West Chester, we schedule maybe 20 baseball games and invite four schools out to our two diamonds. We start at 8:00 o'clock Saturday morning and have to be done because the baseball kids have to park cars for the football game. We play an hour apiece and switch fields and have the manager out there call balls and strikes. These are not counted as wins or losses in our won-lost record.

President Davis: Dick, I have a question. In baseball, if a student-ath-

lete in fall baseball competed and was injured during the traditional playing season, I would presume that this would be operative. If that young man decided for some reason not to continue on in this sport, there would have been a season of eligibility used in the fall, is that right?

Mr. Yoder: Yes, sir, but you just do not calculate for the hardship rule, the 20 percent hardship rule

[Proposal No. 146 (Page A-106) was approved by Division II (92-47) and by Division III; defeated by Division I.]

Residence Requirement

Clayton W. Chapman (Eastern College Athletic Conference): Mr. President, on behalf of the NCAA Council and the Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification, I move adoption of Proposal No. 148.

[The motion was seconded.]

The adoption of this proposal, Mr. President, and the elimination of the words in italics would result in a consistent application of the use of the summer term for eligibility purposes. That is, that a summer term may not be used to satisfy a term of residence for eligibility purposes regardless of whether that summer term is considered indistinguishable from other regular terms. To date, there is no member of the institution that is documented with the NCAA office that has a summer term that is indistinguishable from a regular term. We, therefore, have this limited legislation that no one is utilizing and we recommend that it be eliminated.

John Semanik (Drexel University): We have a five-year program, and our programs are five years. I differ with him. Our summer term is part of the term of all of our students. We alternate our students. They are in school for six months and out and working in their field of study for six months. So, for those students that are in the school in the summer, it is part of the regular term and is not a special summer session.

[Proposal No. 148 (Page A-107) was approved.]

Transfer Rule — Subvarsity Competition

Richard B. Yoder (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Eastern College Athletic Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 149.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to permit transfer students from four-year and two-year colleges the opportunity to participate immediately in their sport upon transfer, provided, however, participation occurs only at the subvarsity level and provided that the subvarsity competition is counted as one of the student-athlete's seasons of competition in the sport involved. Before the NCAA's Bylaw 5 regulation had in-season competition, the ECAC permitted transfers to compete at the subvarsity level with no adverse effects. It allows a student in good academic standing and making normal progress, and who is going to graduate, some time to transfer rather than lose a whole year of no competition. If the student does decide to compete, it counts as one of the four years of competition. Division III adopted the waiver at last year's Convention. We offer the same proposal again this year, and now we urge its adoption by our colleagues in Divisions I and II.

[Proposal No. 149 (Page A-108) was approved by Division II (81-57); defeated by Division I after a motion to cease debate was approved.]

Transfer Waiver — Discontinued Sport

Patricia H. Miller (Harvard University): On behalf of the Eastern College Athletic Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 150.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 150—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The amendment to the amendment simply clarifies the original amendment. The intent of No. 150 removes the restriction imposed by the NCAA Manual Case No. 321, which requires that the student must transfer from his or her original institution at the end of the academic year in which the sport was dropped in order to qualify for the waiver of the residency requirement. What interest is served by forcing a student to transfer immediately to pursue continued participation in the sport when academic or other legitimate considerations are equally as important to the student in deciding on the school in which he or she wishes to transfer? This amendment will allow the student to transfer to the certifying institution at any time after the sport has been dropped and take advantage of the waiver in his or her sport so long as he or she does not participate in that sport on the intercollegiate level during the intervening time. Secondly, it is often impossible for students to gain immediate acceptance as a transfer student to the institution of his or her choice on the date on which the announcement was made that the sport was discontinued late in the year. Again it doesn't seem fair to force a student to consider only those institutions that will accept transfer applications at a late date if only for the sole purpose of satisfying a transfer-rule waiver. Lastly, the institution in which the student is transferring would not be abused in any way if the student were to delay making a decision to transfer to another institution that offers intercollegiate competition in his or her sport.

[Proposal No. 150—1 (Page A-109) was approved by all divisions.]

[Proposal No. 150 (Page A-108) was approved by all divisions as amended by No. 150—1.]

Transfer Rule — Nonrecruited Student-Athlete

Daniel P. Starr (Canisius College): On behalf of the Eastern College Athletic Conference sponsors, I would like to move adoption of No. 151.

[The motion was seconded.]

The delegates who were present at the 76th Convention may recall that legislation was adopted that permitted a waiver of the transfer rule residence requirement for a student-athlete transferring from one four-year college to another, provided the student never had been recruited or had never received any athletics financial aid and had neither practiced nor competed in any intercollegiate athletics activity prior to transfer. In essence, therefore, the transfer rule waiver that was adopted in January, 1982, was adopted to provide immediate eligibility for a transferring student-athlete who had virtually no exposure whatsoever to intercollegiate athletics while attending NCAC-member colleges. One might label that legislation as a waiver of the transfer rule for the pure walk-on student. The sponsors of Proposal No. 151 have experienced situations where the same walk-on student who has never been recruited, never received athletics financial aid and has never participated in intercollegiate athletics, may perhaps have participated in one or two days of preseason tryouts in a particular sport. It seems to us such pure walk-on students with that lim-

ited preseason tryout is a walk-on. It seems logical to us that there is equal justification to providing that same student a waiver of the residence requirement of the transfer rule. For these reasons, we urge the Convention to approve Proposal No. 151.

Rudy Carvajal (University of California, Bakersfield): I would like clarification on the term nonrecruited. That doesn't only apply to the institution where the student winds up, that also applies to anybody who may contact that student, is that correct?

President Davis: It applies if that student was ever recruited, either at the first or second institution.

[Proposal No. 151 (Page A-109) was approved by Division I (174-86) and by Division II.]

Transfer Rule — One-Time Exception

Lewis A. Cryer (Pacific Coast Athletic Association): On behalf of the Council and the Division I Steering Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 152.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Council is sponsoring this only for Division I. Other sponsors have submitted it for Division II. The principal intent of this legislation is to eliminate the one-time exception to the normal transfer residence requirements for a student-athlete transferring under the circumstances described in the legislation. It is our belief, unfortunately, at least at the Division I level, that it has been abused for athletics purposes. Despite its wording, students have virtually induced a nonrenewal of financial aid so that they can take advantage of Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(14). The division should have a one-year requirement or remove it but should not let the residence requirement slip away to inconsistent administration of this bylaw. Institutions on occasion have failed to certify all six factors required for the waiver and simply grant no objection to the transfer criterion allowing the student-athlete to be immediately eligible. Another problem has to do with whether or not the athletics aid was not renewed independent of the athlete's desire to transfer. No doubt many of you have had some Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(14) stories that tell it all. The immediate effective date means that student-athletes who have not already been formally accepted at the new institution prior to the Convention could not utilize the rule to become immediately eligible at the new Division I institution if the proposal is adopted in Division I. I ask you on behalf of the Council and the Division I Steering Committee to support Proposal No. 152.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy League Presidents): I would like to speak in opposition to this appeal. Lew Cryer is right, we have 14 stories to tell. I know of people that have transferred honestly for educational reasons and continue to have successful education and athletics careers. We have already under this proposal taken out football, basketball and ice hockey, because it was believed that those sports were not easy to administer. If, in fact, the problem in the remaining sports were students who were acting improperly, it seems to me incumbent on the Steering Committee to draft a proposal that will deal with the students who were transferring improperly and not post a barrier to the 100 students who transfer properly for legitimate reasons to many of our institutions. I urge defeat of this proposal.

Fran Koenig (Central Michigan University): At the women's meeting Wednesday afternoon, this topic came up. As many of you know, this one-

time transfer has been a topic that many women have supported over the years. It appeared from the discussions that perhaps one sport in addition to basketball, football and ice hockey may be the one that is being abused. To give time to have a further look at this and not to bring it to a vote when we have been discussing many issues for nine hours — and the mood obviously is for quick adjournment — I move that this be referred to the Recruiting Committee so that we don't in haste throw out the baby with the bath water.

[The motion was seconded.]

Richard J. Dunn (University of Washington): I would point out to the Convention that this proposal has been before the past two Conventions in virtually the same form. It seems to me there has been ample time for us to consider this proposal as we have prepared for these Conventions. I urge that we do not defer it.

[Proposal No. 152 (Page A-110) was defeated by Division I (93-178) and by Division II. Motion to refer to the Recruiting Committee was defeated by Divisions I and II. Motion to cease debate was approved.]

REPORT OF COMMITTEES

[Note: The delegates heard reports and approved the slate of candidates from the Men's Committee on Committees, the Women's Committee on Committees and the Nominating Committee.]

President Davis: Permit me to make a few parting remarks now that we have completed the business on the agenda. Two years ago when I succeeded John Toner as president of the NCAA, I identified three areas that I hoped the NCAA would emphasize during my term of office. The first was the academic well-being of the student-athletes, including those matters dealing with initial eligibility, academic progress, success in achieving graduations, support services, and the issues of reporting and accountability for academics in athletics. The second area dealt with the integrity of institutions seeking competitive equity and the resolve of the membership for a strengthened enforcement program and compliance with rules of the membership. The third area was governance of the Association, considering the rich diversity of interests and the desire to provide optimum opportunities for intercollegiate athletics for men and women in all of our institutions.

In my opinion, the membership of the NCAA has successfully addressed all of these areas. The Presidents Commission, the Council, several key committees, Walter Byers and his staff have all aggressively developed proposals and programs that the membership has adopted and that has aroused positive response from the entire academic community. Without going into detail, I wish to say only that I believe that the academic quality of the athletes entering member institutions has improved significantly; and the NCAA is dealing effectively with issues of competitive equity and enforcement. Many of the proposals at this Convention, especially those by the Council and the Presidents Commission grouping, continue progress toward institutional control, federated voting and academic integrity. I will leave the position of president with the hope that this momentum in building institutional integrity and control and a more effective Association will continue and will resolve in skilled leadership.

Permit me to share with you some observations I have accumulated over

the past four years as secretary-treasurer and as president. Last month, I had the honor of presenting the scholar athlete at the National Hall of Fame and I also experienced giving the NCAA Top XII at our honors luncheon. There is no question that the effect of athletics participation on these outstanding men and women was like magic. These people are high achievers who excel in virtually everything they do. My observation over the years is that participation in athletics usually has the same positive influence on average people and even on low achievers. We honor the outstanding persons for whom athletics has been harmonious, but we need to recognize those for whom athletics made possible their education or even their becoming productive human beings. Once, an athlete at my own institution was orphaned at the age of four, was a leader in a New York street gang at the age of 12, served time in Sing Sing and three other maximum security prisons for armed robbery and grand theft. Yet, through his own initiative, he has graduated from high school and junior college; and through participation in basketball, he is well on his way to being a contributor in society. What a marvelous success story. My only fear for this young man is that he could become a lawyer, or even worse, may turn to sports writing. (Laughter) The point is that intercollegiate athletics has had a profound effect on the lives of a large number of young men and women. Let us not be discouraged when one of our high risk students falls by the wayside.

The second observation I gained is that many institutions, sportswriters and the public believe that the NCAA has too many nit-picking rules. In fact, in comments relative to the NCAA Manual in a recent article syndicated by the Associated Press, John Nelson quoted Lou Carnesecca as follows: "Our Lord gave us 10 commandments and look at the trouble we have with those." Understand that some folks in modern society prefer to say the 10 guidelines rather than the 10 commandments. As a result, there are statutes dealing with criminal and civil laws that are replete with indeterminations and precedence. In athletics, we wouldn't even need to observe all of the 10 commandments, just the 10th: "Thou shall not covenant that that is thy neighbor's," or maybe the ninth, "Thou shall not bear false witness against thy neighbor." Even so, I am sure that someone would propose an interpretation that a neighbor should be refrained from recruiting someone residing within a 30-mile radius. Too many of us prefer not to believe or live by our own rules or that the modern day Golden Rule — that is whoever has the gold, rules — takes precedence over the rules of the ethical conduct. We are all guilty of nit-picking, nit-picking rather basic clear rules to the point that reasonable interpretations to all of this nit-picking produced a Manual that may be cumbersome. My observation in this regard is that many institutions and coaching staffs are returning to a more accepting attitude about the need for rules.

Additionally, efforts to reorganize the Manual and redefine it is a project the Council has initiated this year and will have a revolutionary effect. Those who believe that we have too many nit-picking rules should understand like Pogo who the nit-pickers really are and should take comfort in the fact that all democratic organizations do tend to produce many rules. The NCAA is responsive to the problems that rules sometimes create and has the mechanism to change. Putting nit-picking aside, I would emphasize that this Association has taken a firm position that the well-being of stu-

dent-athletes is a primary interest. We will not tolerate those institutions that cheat on their own students, those who will not provide proper support services for high academic risk athletes or who allow students to major in eligibility rather than in education. In spite of some of those who believe that academic reporting and the institutional self-study adds just more paper work, let me say to you that those who espouse or do not fear academic accountability are those that will not hesitate to put their record on the line.

One last observation. The singlemost important recent event affecting the future of the NCAA in promoting harmony and integrity in intercollegiate athletics was the adoption by the membership of legislation formed by the Presidents Commission. We met Wednesday to determine, among other things, whether we should have a special Convention next June. In general, I believe that the presidents, athletics directors, coaches and faculty representatives all agree in principle on the role and value of intercollegiate athletics in higher education. The presidents will disagree on priorities and strategies in the same way that athletics directors will disagree. Somehow presidents seem to have a greater ability to transcend these differences. At the special Convention in June 1985, the NCAA membership overwhelmingly adopted 12 important legislative proposals dealing with academic accountability, enforcement and institutional controls. The special Convention next June may involve greater differences of opinion regarding cost containment and the proper strategies to achieve those desired objectives. I suggest to you emphatically that whatever our differences may be on cost reduction, this is the time for us to reflect with meticulous and critical considerations on the financial status of intercollegiate athletics and on the quality of athletics opportunities for men and women students on our campuses.

We must consider the future for our course and the very purpose of this Association, which is to initiate, stimulate and improve intercollegiate athletics programs for student-athletes. I am convinced that we can preserve the significance of football and basketball in Division I institutions in generating support for those institutions, but only if the institutions are willing to work together and to maintain a broad-based program of optimum athletics opportunities. So I, therefore, urge your thoughtful support of the precepts of this special Convention and your decent consideration of different points of view. As a parting comment, I wish to acknowledge the gratitude, the dedicated service of those members of the NCAA Council whose terms expire at this Convention and who are not eligible for reelection.

Lastly, I wish to recognize especially the outstanding leadership of Walter Byers and to thank him for his able and effective guidance of the Association and especially for his help to me. He is one of the most capable and dedicated administrators with whom I have ever worked. I am grateful to him more than words can ever express. I have always enjoyed working with the unsung heroes like Ted Tow, Tom Jernstedt, Ruth Berkey, Lou Spry, Dave Cawood, Bill Hunt and many others. If I have missed anyone else, you still have my undying gratitude. One of the great joys I have had in my term as president of the Association is working with so many good people. So thanks to all of you on the staff for the best two years I have ever had. I will never forget them.

Wilford S. Bailey: (Auburn University): I would reaffirm what Jack has

said with regard to the accomplishments we have made, the directions in which we are going and the successes we have endeavored to achieve integrity. Louis Thomas, the distinguished physician and author, has observed in a recent essay that integrity is the most important of qualities. Groups and societies cannot possess this until the individual mortals have it in hand. It is hard work for civilization. We all know that integrity is indeed hard work for intercollegiate athletics. It cannot be achieved without our most sincere and concentrated efforts as individuals. If we concentrate on that and work in a true spirit of cooperation in the Association and in our conferences, in our institutions, horizontally and vertically, we can succeed and indeed we cannot fail.

[The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.]

Appendix A

81st Annual Convention

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words that appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words that appear in **bold face** are to be added. All proposed amendments shall be effective as indicated; the term "Immediately" means that the legislation, if adopted, becomes effective upon adjournment of the Convention. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1986-87 NCAA Manual. All votes were by show of paddles unless otherwise indicated. *Only those proposed amendments upon which the 81st annual Convention took some action appear in this appendix. Amendments to amendments immediately follow the proposal to which they relate.*]

TOPICAL GROUPINGS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 81st ANNUAL CONVENTION

<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>General Topic</i>
1 through 6	Consent—Constitution
7 through 43	Consent—Bylaws and Other
44 through 61	Presidents Commission Grouping
62 through 73	Academics
74 through 92	Recruiting
93 through 97	Financial Aid
98 through 104	Amateurism
105 through 113	Membership and Classification
114 through 121	Championships
122 through 134	Playing and Practice Seasons
135 through 144	General
145 through 152	Eligibility

Consent Package—Constitution, Special Rules

Proposals 1 through 6 are offered as a "consent package" of constitutional and other amendments considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature. Any objection from an active or voting conference member to any item contained in this package will remove that item for a separate vote. The remainder of the package will be acted upon with a single vote, requiring a two-thirds majority approval for adoption.

NO. 1 ANNUAL INDEPENDENT FINANCIAL AUDIT

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(c), page 17, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) All expenditures for or in behalf of an institution's

intercollegiate athletics programs, including those by any outside organization, agency or group of individuals (two or more), shall be subject to an annual financial audit conducted for the institution by a qualified auditor who is not a staff member of the institution and who is selected either by the institution's chief executive officer or by an institutional administrator from outside the athletics department designated by the chief executive officer (in addition to any regular financial audit policies and procedures of the institution). The audit report for one fiscal year shall be completed and presented to the chief executive officer prior to the end of the institution's next fiscal year."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To affirm that the annual independent financial audit of a member institution's intercollegiate athletics programs conducted for one fiscal year shall be completed prior to the end of the institution's next fiscal year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Nos. 1 through 6 were approved as a constitution/special rules consent package.

NO. 2 ELIGIBILITY APPEALS

Constitution: Amend O.I. 11, following Constitution 4-2-(a), page 30, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"O.I. 11. If a student-athlete is ineligible under the terms of the constitution, bylaws or other legislation of the Association, the institution shall be obligated immediately to apply the applicable rule and withhold the student-athlete from all intercollegiate competition. Subsequent to this action, the member institution may appeal to the NCAA Eligibility Committee if the member concludes that the circumstances warrant restoration of the student-athlete's eligibility. Such appeal must be submitted in the name of the institution by the chief executive officer, faculty athletics representative or director of athletics (for the men's or women's program); and at least one of those individuals must participate in any hearing of the appeal that involves direct participation by the student-athlete or other individuals representing the institution or the student-athlete. A student-athlete is responsible for his or her involvement in a secondary or major violation of NCAA regulations [as defined in Section 2-(d) of the NCAA enforcement procedure] and the Eligibility Committee may restore the eligibility of a student involved in such a violation only when circumstances clearly warrant restoration. The eligibility of a student-athlete involved in a major violation shall not be restored other than through an exception authorized by the Eligibility Committee in a unique case on the basis of specifically stated reasons."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify that when a member institution has separate administrative structures for its men's and women's athletics programs, the individual serving as director for either program may process an eligibility appeal under the prescribed procedure.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 3 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 2-(a), page 38, by adding new subparagraph (4), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(4) Whenever necessary to adjust the membership of the Executive Committee so that vacancies will occur in the proper sequence, members may be appointed for less than full terms. Members appointed to fill vacancies shall be appointed only for the unexpired portion of that term. In these instances, members who serve more than one-half term shall be considered to have served a full term."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit the appointment of Executive Committee members for less than full terms when necessary to adjust the membership of the committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 4 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 2-(c)-(2), page 39, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(2) Employ an executive director, with the approval of the Council, who shall be administratively responsible to the Executive Committee and who shall be authorized to employ such other persons as may be necessary to conduct efficiently the business of the Association."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify that the executive director is administratively responsible to the Executive Committee and is authorized to employ staff personnel.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 5 LEGISLATION AND INTERPRETATIONS COMMITTEE

A. Constitution: Amend Article 6, Section 2, page 48, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 2. Interpretations. The Council, in the interim

between Conventions, and the Administrative Committee and the Legislation and Interpretations Committee, in the interim between meetings of the Council, are empowered to make interpretations of the constitution and bylaws that shall be binding after their publication and circulation to the membership, or after notification to a member institution when the interpretation is limited to that institution and not of general significance or application to the membership at large. Any member of the Association may request that any such interpretation be passed upon by the next annual Convention by making request in writing to the secretary prior to 1 p.m. on the day preceding the division business sessions of the Convention."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3-(g), pages 155-156, by deleting the present language and substituting new paragraph (p), relettering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(p) The Legislation and Interpretations Committee shall consist of 10 members, including four from Division I and three each from Divisions II and III. Three positions shall be allocated for men, three allocated for women and four unallocated. At least three members of the committee shall be members of the Council. It shall act jointly to determine interpretations of NCAA legislation applicable to all divisions, and in reviewing such matters, only two members each from Divisions II and III may participate. In the review of a federated matter, all committee members for a given division may participate in the determination of an interpretation that applies only to its division. It also shall classify all legislation enacted by the Association that amends the constitution or bylaws and accurately incorporate such legislation therein. The committee shall not have the authority to alter an existing Council interpretation, and its decision shall be binding unless overturned upon appeal to the Council at its next regularly scheduled meeting or to the annual Convention."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish a Legislation and Interpretations Committee, incorporating both interpretative responsibilities and the previous assignments of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 6 AMENDMENTS—OFFICIAL NOTICE

A. Constitution: Amend Constitution 7, Section 2, page 51, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 2. The secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendment to all members of the Association not later than November 22 29 preceding an annual Convention, or 45 days

preceding a special Convention. If the Council establishes a date later than November 1 for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention in accordance with Constitution 7-1-(a), it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for mailing a copy of the proposed amendment to the members."

B. Bylaws: Amend Bylaw 13, Section 2, page 169, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 2. The secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendment to all members of the Association not later than November 22 29 preceding an annual Convention, or 45 days preceding a special Convention or 30 days preceding the annual Division I-A or I-AA legislative meeting. If the Council establishes a date later than November 1 for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention in accordance with Bylaw 13-1-(a), it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for mailing a copy of the proposed amendment to the members."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To provide an additional week following the deadline for receipt of proposed amendments (November 1) before the Official Notice of an annual Convention must be mailed to the membership.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

Consent Package—Bylaws, Other

Proposals 7 through 43 are offered as a "consent package" of bylaws and executive regulations considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature. Any objection from an active or voting conference member to any item contained in this package will remove that item for a separate vote. The remainder of the package will be acted upon by a single vote, with a majority vote required for approval.

NO. 7 COLLEGE ALL-STAR FOOTBALL AND BASKETBALL CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 3-(h), page 76, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(h) All certified games shall provide insurance for each participating student-athlete in the amounts of \$10,000 death and dismemberment insurance and ~~\$10,000~~ **\$25,000** accident-travel insurance."

Source: NCAA Council (Extra Events Committee).

Intent: To increase from \$10,000 to \$25,000 the required amount of accident travel insurance for each participant in a certified college all-star football or basketball contest.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Nos. 7, 9, 11 through 19, 21 through 29, 31 through 38, 40, 41 and 43 were approved as a bylaws and other legislation consent package.

NO. 8 COLLEGE ALL-STAR FOOTBALL CERTIFICATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 3-(j), page 76, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(j) To be certified, a college all-star football game shall be played on or before January 15 21 during the academic year in which the participating student-athletes have exhausted their seasons of eligibility in the sport of football."

Source: NCAA Council (Extra Events Committee).

Intent: To extend from January 15 to January 21 the latest permissible date on which a certified college all-star football game can be played.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Approved by all divisions after being removed from consent package.

NO. 9 GYMNASTICS AND TRACK AND FIELD MEETS

Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 4, by adding new paragraph (m), page 77, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(m) All certified gymnastics and track and field meets shall provide insurance for each participating student-athlete in the amounts of \$10,000 death and dismemberment insurance and \$25,000 accident-travel insurance."

Source: NCAA Council (Extra Events Committee).

Intent: To require \$10,000 death and dismemberment insurance and \$25,000 accident-travel insurance for student-athletes participating in certified gymnastics and track and field meets.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 10 TRACK AND FIELD CERTIFICATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 4-(l), page 77, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(l) In the sport of track and field, certification will not be granted to any outdoor meet that is not to be concluded at least three days prior to the start of the National Collegiate Division I Men's and Women's Outdoor Track Championships or that is to begin sooner than three days after the conclusion of those championships."

Source: NCAA Council (Extra Events Committee).

Intent: To ensure that no certified track and field meets will conflict with the National Collegiate Division I Men's and Women's Outdoor Track Championships.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions after being removed from consent package.

NO. 11 FIVE-YEAR RULE

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(b)-(1), page 91, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions II and III, divided vote]

"(1) For an institution that determines registration other than on a traditional semester or quarter basis, the NCAA Eligibility Academic Requirements Committee shall determine an equivalent enrollment period."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To transfer responsibility for eligibility certification under this provision from the NCAA Eligibility Committee to the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 12 INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(c), page 92, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) The student-athlete shall, at the time of competition, be registered for at least a minimum full-time program of studies as defined by the institution, which, in any event, shall not be less than 12 semester hours or 12 quarter hours (or a similar minimum academic load as determined by the NCAA Eligibility Academic Requirements Committee in an institution that determines registration other than on a traditional semester- or quarter-hour basis or conducts a cooperative educational program; or a minimum full-time graduate program as defined by the institution and approved by the NCAA Eligibility Academic Requirements Committee in the event fewer than 12 hours are required, but which may be no fewer than eight hours); further, if the competition takes place between terms, the student-athlete shall have been so registered in the term immediately preceding the date of competition or, for an entering or returning student, shall be accepted for enrollment as a regular, full-time student for the immediate succeeding regular term."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To specify that the NCAA Academic Requirements Commit-

tee has the responsibility to review exceptions to the minimum academic load requirements.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 13 INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(c)-(1), page 92, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) The minimum full-time program of studies requirement of paragraph (c) may be waived for a full-time student who resides in the final semester or quarter of the student's baccalaureate program, provided the institution's registrar certifies that the student is carrying for credit the courses necessary to complete the degree requirements as determined by the faculty of the institution. The student granted eligibility under this exception also shall be eligible for **any NCAA competition that takes place immediately championship that begins within 60 days** following said semester or quarter; however, the student shall thereafter forfeit eligibility in all sports."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To permit the same period of eligibility under this regulation as that prescribed in the related provisions of Bylaw 5-1-(g).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 14 ELIGIBILITY—INITIAL QUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend note following Bylaw 5-1-(j), page 97, as follows:

[Division I only]

"An exception may be granted by the NCAA *Eligibility Academic Requirements* Committee for a student who left high school after completion of the junior year or during the senior year to enter a member institution under an early admissions program open to students solely on the basis of outstanding academic performance and promise, and provided that for the last four semesters completed in high school, the student maintained an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 3.500 (based on a maximum of 4.000) and ranked in the top 20 percent of the student's class, and that the student met all requirements of a qualifier except graduation from high school."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To transfer responsibility for the eligibility certification under this provision from the NCAA Eligibility Committee to the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 15 SPORTS SPONSORSHIP REQUIREMENTS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 1-(b), page 140, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(b) An institution desiring to be a member of Division I shall sponsor a minimum of six varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females in Division I, *with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article. An institution desiring to be a member of Division I shall sponsor a minimum of and six varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, involving all-female teams, with such in Division I. Such sponsorship shall be based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article.*"

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 2-(b), page 145, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(b) An institution desiring to be a member of Division II shall sponsor a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females in Division II, *with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article. An institution desiring to be a member of Division II shall sponsor a minimum of and four varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, involving all-female teams, in Division II effective September 1, 1987, with such. Such sponsorship shall be based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article. One of the two team sports utilized to meet the requirement for all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females may be sponsored in Division I. Institutions that sponsor and conduct athletics programs for only one sex need not meet the minimum sports sponsorship criterion for the other sex.*"

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 3-(b), page 148, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(b) An institution desiring to be a member of Division III shall sponsor a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females in Division III. *An institution desiring to be a member of Division III shall sponsor and a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, involving all-female teams in Division III, except when a waiver has been granted per Constitution 4-2-(g)-(2). Such sponsorship shall be based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article.*"

Source: NCAA Council (Classification Committee).

Intent: To provide consistent language regarding each division's minimum sports sponsorship requirements.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

**NO. 16 EFFECTIVE DATES OF MEMBERSHIP
CRITERIA**

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 1-(g)-(1), page 141, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(1) The institution shall sponsor a minimum of seven varsity intercollegiate sports, including football, involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females in Division I, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article. An institution shall sponsor a minimum of six varsity intercollegiate sports in Division I involving all-female teams *effective September 1, 1986 beginning with the 1985-86 academic year*, and seven such sports *effective September 1, 1987, beginning with the 1986-87 academic year*, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 and subject to the exception provisions of paragraph (c) of Section 1 of this article."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 2-(b), page 145, as follows:
[Division II only]

"(b) An institution desiring to be a member of Division II shall sponsor a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females in Division II, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article. An institution desiring to be a member of Division II shall sponsor a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, involving all-female teams *effective September 1, 1987, beginning with the 1986-87 academic year*, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article. One of the two team sports utilized to meet the requirements for all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females may be sponsored in Division I. Institutions that sponsor and conduct athletics programs for only one sex need not meet the minimum sports sponsorship criterion for the other sex."

C. Bylaws: Amend note following Bylaw 11-4-(a), page 149, as follows:
[Division III only]

"[Note: The provisions of this section shall apply to Division III member institutions *effective September 1, 1987 beginning with the 1987-88 academic year.*]"

D. Bylaws: Amend note following Bylaw 11-4-(b), page 149, as follows:
[Division II only]

"[Note: *Effective August 1, 1988 Beginning with the 1988-89 academic year*, a Division II member institution shall count track as a single sport, with a minimum number of five intercollegiate contests each year.]"

E. Bylaws: Amend note following Bylaw 11-4-(b)-(2), page 150, as follows:

[Division II only]

"[Note: *Effective August 1, 1988 Beginning with the 1988-89*

academic year, a Division II member institution shall count track as a single sport, with a minimum number of 14 participants in each contest.]"

F. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 4-(b)-(6), page 150, as follows:
[Division III only]

"(6) A Division I institution may receive credit for sponsoring both indoor track and outdoor track if its team participates in a total of at least 12 indoor and outdoor meets during the year, with at least four indoor meets and at least four outdoor meets included in the total of 12. Until August 1, 1988, a Division II institution may receive credit in the same manner if its team participates in a total of at least 10 indoor and outdoor meets during the year, with at least three indoor meets and at least three outdoor meets included in the total of 10. After that date, Division II institutions shall count track as a single sport. *Effective September 1, 1987, Beginning with the 1987-88 academic year*, a Division III institution may receive credit for sponsoring both indoor and outdoor track if its team participates in a total of at least 10 indoor and outdoor meets during the year, with at least three indoor meets and at least three outdoor meets included in the total of 10."

Source: NCAA Council (Classification Committee).

Intent: To clarify effective dates of classification legislation.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 17 DIVISION II CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 2-(b), page 145, as follows:
[Division II only]

"(b) An institution desiring to be a member of Division II shall sponsor a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females in Division II, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article. An institution desiring to be a member of Division II shall sponsor a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, involving all-female teams *effective September 1, 1987, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article*. One of the two team sports utilized to meet the requirement for all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females **or for all-female teams** may be sponsored in Division I. Institutions that sponsor and conduct athletics programs for only one sex need not meet the minimum sports sponsorship criterion for the other sex."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit Division II member institutions to count one Division I team sport for men (or a mixed team of men and women) and one Division I team sport for women in meeting Division II sports sponsorship minimum requirements.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 18 COUNCIL-APPOINTED COMMITTEES

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3-(a), page 154, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) The Council of the Association is empowered to appoint the following committees, including the chair of each, and any other special committees it deems necessary. Each of the following Council-appointed committees, except the Committee on Infractions, the National Youth Sports Program Committee, and the Committee on Review and Planning, shall include at least one member of the Council, who shall serve as an ex officio committee member and shall be ineligible to serve as chair. Unless otherwise specified herein, the actions of such committees shall be subject to approval of the Council."

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Committee).

Intent: To require that at least one member of each Council-appointed committee as set forth in Bylaw 12-3 shall be a member of the Council, and such member shall not be permitted to chair the committee.

Effective Date: Immediately; Council members shall be appointed as committee restructuring or attrition permits.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 19 ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3-(b), page 154, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(b) The Academic Requirements Committee shall consist of six 12 members, including six representing Division I and three each representing Divisions II and III; including two positions allocated for men, two allocated for women and two unallocated, and shall include at least one representative from each division four positions shall be allocated for men, four positions allocated for women and four unallocated. It shall be responsible for review and consideration of those portions of the Association's constitution and bylaws that relate to principles of sound academic requirements."

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Committee).

Intent: To expand the Academic Requirements Committee from six to 12 members.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 20 CLASSIFICATION COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3, by deleting paragraph (c), pages 154-155, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) The Classification Committee shall be responsible for the classification and reclassification of the division membership of each member institution. It shall review each application for active membership in the Association to determine whether the applicant meets the applicable provisions set forth in Bylaws 10 and 11. It also shall conduct an annual review to determine whether each member institution is continuing to meet the criteria of its division. The committee shall consist of nine members, including three positions allocated for men, three allocated for women and three unallocated. Four members shall be from Division I, two members from Division II and two members from Division III, and one shall be selected at large."

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Committee).

Intent: To abolish the Classification Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions after being removed from consent package.

NO. 21 COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3, by deleting paragraphs (u) and (y), pages 158-159, and adding new paragraph (c), page 154, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) The Communications Committee shall consist of 12 members, including at least one from each division and including at least two sports information directors. Four positions shall be allocated for men, four allocated for women and four unallocated. It shall study and make recommendations regarding the Association's public-relations program, shall develop and administer promotional activities for the benefit of the membership generally and for the Association and its championship events, and shall be responsible for any general consideration of television matters."

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Committee).

Intent: To establish a Communications Committee, incorporating the current functions of the Public Relations and Promotion Committee and the Football Television Committee, which would be abolished.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 22 COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGE RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3, by deleting paragraph (f), page 155, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(f) The Community and Junior College Relations Committee shall consist of

four members, with one position allocated for a man, one allocated for a woman and two unallocated. The executive directors of the California Community and Junior College Association and the National Junior College Athletic Association or their designated representatives shall be ex officio members. The committee shall study and make policy or legislative recommendations to the Council concerning relationships between this Association and its members and the nation's community and junior colleges as represented by established regional and national organizations."

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Committee).

Intent: To abolish the Community and Junior College Relations Committee. [Note: The appropriate representatives of the California and national junior college associations will be invited to serve as consultants before appropriate NCAA committees when two-year-college issues are being considered.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 23 COMPETITIVE SAFEGUARDS COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3, by deleting paragraph (h), page 156, and amending paragraph (e), page 155, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(e) The Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports shall consist of 12 15 members, including *four five* positions allocated for men, *four five* allocated for women and *four five* unallocated.

"(1) The membership of the committee shall be constituted as follows: athletics directors or primary women athletics administrators (one man and one woman), active coaching (one member), exercise physiology research (one member), medicine (three members, of whom at least one shall be a woman), athletics training (one man and one woman responsible for the total athletics training program at a member institution), law (one member), one member elected from the NCAA Football Rules Committee, and one member who shall represent secondary school interests, **one undergraduate student-athlete and two members selected at large.**

"(2) The committee, subject to the direction of the Executive Committee, shall collect and develop pertinent information regarding desirable training methods, prevention and treatment of sports injuries, and utilization of sound safety measures at the college level, **drug education and drug testing.**

"(3) The committee shall disseminate such information as might be brought appropriately to the attention of the Association's membership and adopt recommended policies and standards designed to further the above objectives. **It shall supervise the Association's drug-education and drug-testing programs under the direction of the Executive Committee."**

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Committee).

Intent: To expand from 12 members to 15 the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports and assign to it the current functions of the Drug Education Committee, which would be abolished. [Note: It also is intended that the current functions of the Special NCAA Postseason Drug-Testing Committee would be assigned to the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports at the conclusion of the 1986-87 academic year.]

Effective Date: September 1, 1987.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 24 ELIGIBILITY COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3-(i) and (1), page 156, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(i) The Eligibility Committee shall consist of *five 10* members, including *at least one from each division, four from Division I and three each from Divisions II and III and two members of the Council, with three committee members also being Council members.* *Two Three* positions shall be allocated for men, *two three* allocated for women and *one four* unallocated."

"(1) All eligibility cases will be dealt with on a 'federated' basis; i.e., the committee members from the same division as the student-athlete involved will hear the initial appeal. The committee shall have initial authority to determine all matters pertaining to the eligibility of student-athletes competing in the various postseason meets, tournaments and games conducted by the Association, and to act upon all appeals concerning the eligibility of student-athletes submitted by member institutions in accordance with the provisions of Constitution 4-2-(a)-O.I. 11. It shall apply the rules of eligibility established by the Association, provided such application is in accordance with the published and circulated interpretations of the Council concerning the constitution and bylaws of the Association."

[Subparagraphs (2) and (3) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To expand the Eligibility Committee to 10 members and allow for the review of cases on a divisional basis.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 25 COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL AID AND AMATEURISM

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3, by adding new paragraph (1), page 156, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(l) The Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism shall consist of 12 members, including four positions allocated for men, four allocated for women and four unallocated. Six members shall be from Division I, three members from Division II and three members from Division III. At least one institutional financial aid officer shall be included on the committee. It shall be responsible for review and consideration of those portions of the Association's constitution and bylaws that relate to principles governing financial aid and amateurism."

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Committee).

Intent: To establish a Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 26 HONORS COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3, by deleting paragraph (d), page 155, and paragraph (z), page 159, adding new paragraph (m), page 157, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(m) The Honors Committee shall consist of seven members, including three nationally distinguished citizens, one former NCAA president, one former NCAA honors recipient and two members selected at large. Two positions shall be allocated for men, two allocated for women and three unallocated. It shall receive nominations for the Theodore Roosevelt Award and the College Athletics Top XII awards and shall select the recipients of those awards."

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Committee).

Intent: To establish an Honors Committee, incorporating the current functions of the College Athletics Top XII Selection Committee and the Theodore Roosevelt Award Committee, which would be abolished.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 27 INSURANCE COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3, by deleting subparagraph (o), page 157, relettering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(o) The Insurance Committee shall consist of three members, including one position allocated for a man, one allocated for a woman and one unallocated. It shall be responsible for administering and supervising the Association's travel accident and medical insurance and other insurance programs that it might inaugurate as a service to the membership."

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Committee).

Intent: To abolish the Insurance Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 28 PROFESSIONAL SPORTS LIAISON COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3, by deleting paragraph (m), page 157, and paragraph (x), page 158, and amending paragraph (t), page 158, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(t) The Professional Sports Liaison Committee shall consist of eight 12 members, including two four positions allocated for men, two four allocated for women and four unallocated, and including. It shall include conference commissioners experienced in a broad range of intercollegiate sports, at least one director of athletics at a Division I-A football institution, a representative of the American Football Coaches Association, a representative of the National Association of Basketball Coaches, representatives of intercollegiate baseball interests, and representatives of intercollegiate ice hockey interests. It shall study and make recommendations to the Council concerning the relationship between intercollegiate athletics and professional teams and organizations, supervise the distribution of ice hockey developmental funds received by the Association from professional sports organizations, and supervise the conduct of organized summer baseball leagues and teams involving student-athletes of member institutions."

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Committee).

Intent: To expand from eight members to 12 the Professional Sports Liaison Committee and assign to it the current functions of the Ice Hockey Developmental Funding Committee and the Summer Baseball Committee, which would be abolished. [Note: The three current committees would be combined and would reach the specified committee size by attrition.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 29 COMMITTEE ON REVIEW AND PLANNING

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3, by deleting paragraph (p), page 157, and adding new paragraph (x), page 159, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(x) The Committee on Review and Planning shall consist of seven members, including six former officers of the Association and one former student-athlete of current national prominence, and shall include at least one representative from each division. At least one member of the com-

mittee shall be a woman. It shall identify and examine trends and problems of intercollegiate athletics, recommend goals, suggest to the Council courses of action that the Association may wish to pursue, and consider such other topics as may be referred to it by the Council."

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Committee).

Intent: To establish a Committee on Review and Planning, consisting primarily of former NCAA officers, incorporating the current functions of the Long Range Planning Committee, which would be abolished, as well as other assignments from the NCAA Council.

Effective Date: September 1, 1987.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 30 SPECIAL-EVENTS COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3, by deleting paragraphs (k) and (l), page 156, and paragraph (s), page 157, adding new paragraph (y), page 158, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(y) The Special-Events Committee shall consist of 13 members, including at least eight representatives of Division I-A, at least one of them from each NCAA district except District 1, and five additional members. The five additional members shall include one representative of high school interests recommended by the executive director of the National Federation of State High School Associations. The committee shall include at least two women. The eight Division I-A representatives shall act as a subcommittee on postseason football matters, with its duties and functions set forth in Bylaws 2-1 and 2-2. The full committee shall act on issues involving extra events, as set forth in Bylaws 2-1, 2-3 and 2-4, and high school all-star contests, as set forth in Constitution 3-9-(a)."

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Committee).

Intent: To establish a Special-Events Committee, incorporating the current functions of the Extra Events Committee, High School All-Star Games Committee and Postseason Football Committee, which would be abolished. [Note: The three current committees would be combined and would reach the specified committee size by attrition.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions after being removed from consent package.

NO. 31 FOOTBALL TELEVISION COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3, by deleting paragraph (y) and subparagraphs (1) through (7), pages 158-159, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(y) The Football Television Committee shall consist of 18 members and shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) Nine members representing Division I-A football, with one member representing Districts 1 and 2, two members representing District 3; one member each representing Districts 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, and one member selected at large;

"(2) Two women members, at least one of whom shall represent Division I-A football;

"(3) Four members representing Division I-AA football, with one member representing each Division I-AA football region, and

"(4) Three members representing Divisions II and III, with each of those divisions being represented by at least one member.

"(5) The members representing Divisions I-AA and II shall include, as to each division, at least one current or former member of that division's football committee.

"(6) One of the Division I-A football members shall be elected chair.

"(7) The committee shall act as one body for the formulation of any voluntary football television plan that may be applicable to all divisions and for the adoption and administration of such a plan, but representatives from the respective divisions shall be responsible for the formulation of any voluntary football television plan provisions that may be applicable solely to their respective divisions."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To abolish the Football Television Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 32 VOLUNTEERS FOR YOUTH COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3, by deleting paragraph (aa), page 159, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(aa) The Volunteers for Youth Committee shall consist of five members, including two positions allocated for men, two allocated for women and one unallocated, and shall include at least one representative from each division. At least one member of the committee shall be from each of the following geographical regions: (1) Districts 1 and 2, (2) District 3, (3) Districts 4 and 5, and (4) Districts 6, 7 and 8. It shall supervise the Volunteers for Youth program."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To abolish the Volunteers for Youth Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 33 COMMITTEE ON WOMEN'S ATHLETICS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3, by adding new paragraph (bb), page 159, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(bb) The Committee on Women's Athletics shall consist of 12 members, including six members from Division I, three members from Division II and three members from Division III. Four positions shall be allocated for men, four allocated for women and four unallocated; one member shall be an undergraduate student-athlete who is a varsity letter-winner. It shall study and make policy recommendations to the Council concerning opportunities for women in athletics at the institutional, conference and national levels, as well as other issues directly affecting women's athletics."

Source: NCAA Council (Long Range Planning Committee).

Intent: To establish a Committee on Women's Athletics as a standing committee of the Association.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 34 DIVISION CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEES

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, pages 151-167, by adding new Section 4, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 4. Executive Committee-Appointed Committees. (a) The Executive Committee of the Association is empowered to appoint the following committees, including the chair of each, and any other special committees it deems necessary. Unless otherwise specified herein, the actions of such committees shall be subject to approval of the Executive Committee.

Division I Championships Division III Championships
Division II Championships

"(b) The Division I Championships Committee shall consist of the eight Division I representatives on the Executive Committee (excluding the president and secretary-treasurer). Members' terms shall coincide with their terms on the Executive Committee. It shall make recommendations to the Executive Committee regarding allocation of revenues generated by National Collegiate Championships and Division I championships, supervise qualification and/or selection procedures for those events, maintain oversight responsibility for applicable playing regulations, review recommendations from sports committees regarding the conduct and administration of those championships, and process other issues related to the administration of the events.

"(c) The Division II Championships Committee shall consist of five members, including the two Division II members of the Executive Committee, two of the Division II representatives serving on the NCAA Council and one

member selected at large. Terms of the Executive Committee and Council members shall coincide with their terms on those bodies. The at-large member shall serve a one-year term and shall be limited to not more than five years in that position. The committee shall make recommendations to the Executive Committee regarding allocation of the Executive Committee-approved subsidy for the conduct of Division II championships, supervise qualification and/or selection procedures for those events, maintain oversight responsibility for applicable playing regulations, review recommendations from sports committees regarding the conduct and administration of those championships, and process other issues related to the administration of the events.

"(d) The Division III Championships Committee shall consist of five members, including the two Division III members of the Executive Committee, two of the Division III representatives serving on the NCAA Council and one member selected at large. Terms of the Executive Committee and Council members shall coincide with their terms on those bodies. The at-large member shall serve a one-year term and shall be limited to not more than five years in that position. The committee shall make recommendations to the Executive Committee regarding allocation of the Executive Committee-approved subsidy for the conduct of Division III championships, supervise qualification and/or selection procedures for those events, maintain oversight responsibility for applicable playing regulations, review recommendations from sports committees regarding the conduct and administration of those championships, and process other issues related to the administration of the events."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish the existing Divisions I, II and III Championships Committees as standing committees of the Association, rather than special committees.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 35 MEN'S AND WOMEN'S RIFLE COMMITTEE

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(a)-(4), page 160, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(4) The secretary-rules editor of each of the following committees may be reelected without restriction: Baseball, Men's Basketball Rules, Men's Fencing, Football Rules, Men's Ice Hockey, Men's Lacrosse, Men's and Women's Rifle, Men's Soccer, Men's Swimming, Men's and Women's Track and Field, Men's Water Polo, and Wrestling. Except for the Men's Basketball Rules and Football Rules Committees, the secretary-rules editor shall be a nonvoting member of the committee."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(j), page 162, as follows:

"(j) The Men's and Women's Rifle Committee shall consist of *six seven* members. One member shall be elected secretary-rules editor."

Source: NCAA Council (Men's and Women's Rifle Committee).

Intent: To specify that the secretary-rules editor of the Men's and Women's Rifle Committee may be reelected without restriction and is a nonvoting member of the committee, increasing the number of committee members from six to seven.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 36 MEN'S GYMNASTICS COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(g), page 161, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(g) The Men's Gymnastics Committee shall consist of six members and shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) At least one representative from each of the four men's gymnastics regions, plus two representatives *elected at large from any of the men's gymnastics regions*;

"(2) *Three* Four members shall be from Division I, one member shall be from Division II, *one member shall be from or* Division III and one member shall be elected at large."

[Subparagraphs (3) and (4) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Men's Gymnastics Committee).

Intent: To require an additional Division I member on the Men's Gymnastics Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 37 MEN'S AND WOMEN'S SWIMMING COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4, page 163, by deleting paragraphs (m) and (n) and substituting new paragraph (m), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(m) The Men's and Women's Swimming Committee shall consist of 19 members and shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) At least one representative from each of the eight NCAA districts.

"(2) Eight members shall be from Division I and shall comprise a Division I subcommittee. Four members of the subcommittee shall represent men's swimming interests and four members shall represent

women's swimming interests, including three positions allocated for men, three allocated for women and two unallocated.

"(3) Four members shall be from Division II and shall comprise a Division II subcommittee. Two members of the subcommittee shall represent men's swimming interests and two members shall represent women's swimming interests, including one position allocated for a man, one allocated for a woman and two unallocated.

"(4) Four members shall be from Division III and shall comprise a Division III subcommittee. Two members of the subcommittee shall represent men's swimming interests and two members shall represent women's swimming interests, including one position allocated for a man, one allocated for a woman and two unallocated.

"(5) An additional two members shall represent diving interests, one representing men's diving and one representing women's diving. One shall be a Division I representative and the other shall be a Division II or III representative.

"(6) An additional member shall be secretary-rules editor.

"(7) The division subcommittees shall be responsible for administering the respective division championships in swimming.

"(8) A rules-editing subcommittee shall have eight members, including three members appointed by the Division I subcommittee, one member each appointed by the Division II and Division III subcommittees, one member appointed by the committee chair from among the members of the Division II or Division III subcommittee, one member representing diving interests, and the secretary-rules editor. The rules-editing subcommittee shall formulate playing rules subject to the approval of the full committee."

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Committee).

Intent: To establish a combined Men's and Women's Swimming Committee. [Note: The current committees would be combined and would reach the specified committee size by attrition.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 38 SPORTS COMMITTEES-SELECTION CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 5-(a)-(1), page 165, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) The above committees shall develop policies and procedures governing the administration and conduct of the NCAA championships in their respective sports, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee; shall have the authority to establish championships selection criteria that include requirements to utilize regular-season playing rules that conform with those used in NCAA championships, and shall actively supervise the conduct of the respective meets and tournaments, subject to the provisions of Constitution 5-8."

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Intent: To allow sports committees without playing-rules responsibilities to establish championships selection criteria that require playing rules used in the NCAA championships to be used in regular-season competition.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 39 MEN'S AND WOMEN'S FENCING COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Sections 4 and 5, by deleting paragraph 4-(e), page 161, and paragraph 5-(h), page 166, substituting new paragraph 5-(h), page 166, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(h) The Men's and Women's Fencing Committee shall consist of 12 members, six representing men's fencing interests and six representing women's fencing interests. Committee shall act as one body to determine general policies for the men's and women's national championships in fencing, with subcommittees composed of committee members representing men's fencing interests and women's fencing interests responsible for administering the respective championships."

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Committee).

Intent: To establish a combined Men's and Women's Fencing Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately; first meeting of combined committee to occur after the 1987 National Collegiate Men's and Women's Fencing Championships.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 40 MEN'S AND WOMEN'S GOLF COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 5-(m) and (n), page 166, by deleting the present language and substituting new paragraph (m), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(m) The Men's and Women's Golf Committee shall

consist of 14 members, including seven members from Division I, three members from Division II, three members from Division III and one member elected at large. Eight members shall represent men's golf interests, including four from Division I and two each from Divisions II and III. Six shall represent women's golf interests, including three from Division I, one each from Divisions II and III, and one elected at large. Committee shall act as one body to determine general policies for the men's and women's national championships in golf, with subcommittees composed of committee members representing men's golf interests and women's golf interests responsible for administering the respective championships."

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Committee).

Intent: To establish a combined Men's and Women's Golf Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately; first meeting of combined committee to occur after the 1987 championships.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 41 MEN'S AND WOMEN'S TENNIS COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 5-(s) and (t), page 167, by deleting the present language and substituting new paragraph (s), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(s) The Men's and Women's Tennis Committee shall consist of 24 members and shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) Twelve members shall be from Division I and shall comprise a Division I subcommittee. Six members of the subcommittee shall represent men's tennis interests and six members shall represent women's tennis interests, including four positions allocated for men, four allocated for women and four unallocated.

"(2) Six members shall be from Division II and shall comprise a Division II subcommittee. Three members of the subcommittee shall represent men's tennis interests and three members shall represent women's tennis interests, including two positions allocated for men, two allocated for women and two unallocated.

"(3) Six members shall be from Division III and shall comprise a Division III subcommittee. Three members of the subcommittee shall represent men's tennis interests and three members shall represent women's tennis interests, including two positions allocated for men, two allocated for women and two unallocated.

"(4) The division subcommittees shall be responsible for administering the respective division championships in tennis."

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Committee).

Intent: To establish a combined Men's and Women's Tennis Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

NO. 42 ADMINISTRATION OF CHAMPIONSHIPS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 1, Section 1-(a)-(1), page 172, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) A National Collegiate Championship [per Constitution 5-8-(e)] in such a sport may be continued or established if at least seven percent of the all active members of the Association sponsor the sport on a varsity intercollegiate basis, regardless of whether a division championship is conducted in that sport."

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Intent: To provide that members of all three divisions shall be counted toward the sponsorship necessary to continue or establish a National Collegiate Championship, regardless of whether a division championship is conducted in the same sport.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn after being ruled out of order.

NO. 43 INSURANCE POLICY

Recommended Policies: Add new Policy 14, page 212, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Because of the increasing cost of health care and the ongoing risk of liability claims, a variety of athletics-related insurance coverages are worthy of consideration by member institutions. Since state laws and institutional needs vary, the Association takes no position in regard to the types or amounts of insurance that may be appropriate for an institution's athletics department; however, all institutions should review their insurance coverages at least annually with their risk managers and legal counsel."

Source: NCAA Council (Insurance Committee).

Intent: To encourage member institutions to review their athletics-related insurance coverage on an annual basis.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 7.

Presidents Commission Grouping

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following 18 proposals for placement at this point in the agenda.]

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following Proposal Nos. 44 and 45 for roll-call votes.]

NO. 44 FINANCIAL AID LIMITATION

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(1), page 13, by deleting the present language and substituting the following:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) The award to a student-athlete of financial aid that exceeds the cost of attendance that normally is incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at that institution or that exceeds the limitations set forth in Bylaw 6-1 for the membership division of the institution the student-athlete attends, whichever is less."

B. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4, pages 19-23, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

[Paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) unchanged.]

"(d) Where a student-athlete's ability is taken into consideration in any degree in awarding unearned financial aid, such aid shall not be awarded for a period in excess of one academic year; and if such aid combined with that received from the following and similar sources exceeds the amount defined in Constitution 3-1-(g)-(1) and the bylaws, the student-athlete shall not be eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics."

[Subparagraphs (1), (2) and (3) and their subparagraphs deleted.]

[Paragraph (e) deleted and paragraphs (f) and (g) unchanged, relettered as paragraphs (e) and (f).]

"(h) (g) The bylaws of the Association may prescribe additional limitations concerning financial assistance, including restrictions on the amount of financial aid each student-athlete may receive in addition to those set forth in Constitution 3-1-(g)-(1), and limitations as to the number of financial aid awards a member institution may provide to student-athletes. Any financial assistance permitted by a division that would result in a student-athlete's total financial aid exceeding the value of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books and up to the maximum permitted by Constitution 3-1-(g)-(1) and Bylaw 6-1-(a) shall be based upon the demonstrated financial need of the individual student-athlete."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 1, page 116, by deleting the present language and substituting the following:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 1. Amount of Financial Aid. (a) A student-athlete shall not be eligible to participate in intercollegiate

athletics if he or she receives financial aid that exceeds the value of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books.

"(b) In determining whether a student-athlete's financial assistance exceeds the maximum permissible amount set forth in Bylaw 6-1-(a), all funds received from the institution and all funds received from the following and similar sources shall be included.

"(1) Employment during semester or term time, which is an all-inclusive period from the opening to the closing of classes of the regular semester, quarter or term, except for the vacation periods properly listed on the institution's official calendar.

"(i) An institution shall count income from any employment during semester or term time, regardless of whether the student-athlete's job is one obtained following completion of eligibility in the student-athlete's senior year; gifts given to a student-athlete following completion of eligibility in appreciation or recognition of the student-athlete's athletics accomplishments, and any bonus or salary from a professional sports organization, or any other income from participation in an athletics event, no matter when received or contracted for.

"(ii) A student-athlete receiving aid under this section may, however, obtain a job within seven days prior to the beginning of the institution's Christmas vacation period, provided it is necessary to do so to secure the employment. The income so derived from the additional week's employment need not be computed in determining the maximum allowable financial aid.

"(2) Governmental grants for educational purposes, except:

"(i) Benefits received by student-athletes under the G.I. Bill of Rights;

"(ii) Payments to student-athletes for participation in military reserve training programs (for example, payments by the U.S. government for a student's participation in advanced ROTC or National Guard training shall not be construed under this principle to be 'employment' during semester or term time);

"(iii) Payments by the U.S. government under the terms of the War Orphans Educational Program, Social Security Insurance Program or Non-Service-Connected Veteran's Death Pension Program; or

"(iv) Pell Grants, provided the overall grant total, combining financial aid based on athletic

ability and other institutionally administered financial aid and the Pell Grant, does not exceed the value of tuition, fees, room and board, and required course-related books, plus \$900.

"(v) State government awards to disabled veterans, provided such awards are approved by the Council by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting.

"(3) Other scholarships and grants-in-aid, except an honorary award for outstanding academic achievement may be received without its being included in the maximum allowable financial aid computation if it is a standing scholarship award published in the institution's catalog, the basis of the award is the candidate's academic record at the awarding institution and the award is determined by competition among the students of a particular class or college of the institution.

"(4) Loans, except legitimate loans, based upon a regular repayment schedule, available to all students and administered on the same basis for all students.

"(c) In the event that the funds received by a student-athlete from the sources listed in Bylaw 6-1-(b)-(1), (2) or (3), when combined with the value of the institution's grant-in-aid, will exceed the maximum permissible amount set forth in Bylaw 6-1-(a) for the balance of the academic year, the institution shall reduce institutional aid so as not to exceed the amount set forth in Bylaw 6-1-(a). Payments credited to a student-athlete's account that are not refundable by the institution to the scholarship office or other appropriate institutional agency shall not become the student's obligation."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Council Subcommittee to Review Financial Aid Issues).

Intent: To permit each membership division to determine the maximum amount of financial assistance that can be received by a student-athlete attending an institution in that division; to provide that no division may adopt a maximum permissible amount of financial assistance that exceeds the cost of attendance that normally is incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at the involved institution; to provide that any financial assistance permitted by a division in excess of the value of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books shall be based upon the demonstrated financial need of the individual student-athlete, and to retain for the present time the current limitations on the total amount of financial aid a student-athlete may receive.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved (roll-call vote; 549-148, with seven abstentions. See Appendix B).

NO. 45 FINANCIAL AID—PELL GRANTS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(d)-(2)-(iv), page 22, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(iv) Pell Grants, provided the overall grant total, combining financial aid based on athletic ability and other institutionally administered financial aid and the Pell Grant, does not exceed the value of tuition, fees, room and board, and required course-related books, plus \$900."

Source: All 10 members of the Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To exempt the full Pell Grant award from the limitation on the amount of financial aid that a student-athlete may receive under NCAA legislation.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 46 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(6)-(ii), page 98, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(ii) Eligibility for regular-season competition subsequent to the student-athlete's first academic year in residence or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in a sport shall be determined prior to participation and in accordance with the student-athlete's academic status at the beginning of the fall term of the regular academic year based upon: (1) satisfactory completion prior to each term in which a season of competition begins of an accumulative total of semester or quarter hours of academic credit that is equivalent to the completion of an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours during each of the previous academic terms in academic years in which the student-athlete has been enrolled in a term or terms, or (2) satisfactory completion of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of academic credit since the beginning of the student-athlete's last season of competition previous regular fall term. For purposes of this provision, a student-athlete shall meet the 'satisfactory completion' requirement by maintaining a grade-point average that places the student-athlete in good academic standing as established by the institution for all students who are at an equivalent stage of progress toward a degree. If the student-athlete is ineligible under this regulation at the beginning of the fall term, eligibility may be reinstated at the beginning of any other regular term of that academic year, based upon the preceding regular two semesters or three quarters (and also including hours earned in summer sessions during that period)."

Source: NCAA Council (Division I and Division II Steering Committees).

Intent: To require Division I and Division II member institutions to certify eligibility under the satisfactory-progress rule during the fall term of each academic year, to eliminate the option of

determining eligibility on the basis of an average of at least 12 hours of academic credit per term of attendance, to require that a student-athlete's annual academic progress be measured from the beginning of the previous regular fall term, and to provide an opportunity for a student who is ineligible in the fall to become eligible at the beginning of another regular term.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Defeated by Division I (128-169) and by Division II as amended by No. 46-1.

NO. 46-1 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Amend Proposal No. 46, Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6)-(iii), pages 28-29, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Division I and II, divided vote]

"(ii) Eligibility for regular season competition subsequent to the student-athlete's first academic year in residence or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in a sport shall be determined prior to participation competition and in accordance with the student-athlete's academic status at the beginning of the fall term of the regular academic year based upon satisfactory completion of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of academic credit since the previous regular fall term. For purposes of this provision, a student-athlete shall meet the 'satisfactory completion' requirement by maintaining a grade-point average that places the student-athlete in good academic standing as established by the institution for all students who are at an equivalent stage of progress toward a degree. If the student-athlete is ineligible under this regulation at the beginning of the fall term, eligibility may be reinstated at the beginning of any other regular term of that academic year, based upon the preceding regular two semesters or three quarters (and also including hours earned in summer sessions during that period)."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 47 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(b), page 57, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(b) All contact in person with a prospective student-athlete or the prospect's relatives or legal guardian off campus for purposes of recruitment shall be made by institutional staff members. Such in-person, off-campus contact, as well as correspondence and telephone calls, by representatives of an institution's athletics interests is prohibited."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Council Subcommittee to Review the Recruiting Process).

Intent: To prevent any recruiting contact, including correspondence

and telephone calls, by representatives of athletics interests on campus or off campus, limiting involvement in recruiting to institutional staff members.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 48 FOOTBALL RECRUITING AND EVALUATION SEASONS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(4), page 56, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(4) Such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of football only during the period between December 1 *(or the date of the completion of the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college contest, if it occurs thereafter)* and March 1 and the Saturday following the initial day for the signing of the National Letter of Intent in the sport of football, except as prohibited by Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(6). The Council shall have the authority to waive this provision by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting for institutions with established admissions procedures utilizing acceptance dates subsequent to the March 1 normal contact deadline."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3-(b), page 59, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(b) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of football during the period between August 1 and December 1 *(or the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college contest)* the month of November as well as the month of May and for two weeks in May (May 7-21)."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Council Subcommittee to Review the Recruiting Process).

Intent: To limit the contact and evaluation periods in the sport of football as set forth in the proposal.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Approved by Divisions I-A, I-AA and II as amended by No. 48-2.

NO. 48-1 FOOTBALL RECRUITING AND EVALUATION SEASONS

Amend Proposal No. 48-B, Bylaw 1-3-(b), page 30, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(b) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of football during the month of November the period between September 1 and December 1 and for two weeks in May (May 7-21)."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I-A, I-AA and II.

NO. 48-2 FOOTBALL RECRUITING AND EVALUATION SEASONS

Amend Proposal No. 48-B, Bylaw 1-3-(b), page 30, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(b) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of football during the month of November and for two weeks in May (May 7-21) as well as the period beginning May 10 and ending May 31."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Approved by Divisions I-A, I-AA and II. First defeated in the Divisions I-AA and II; later motions to reconsider were approved and both approved the amendment.

NO. 48-3 FOOTBALL RECRUITING AND EVALUATION SEASONS

Amend Proposal No. 48-B, Bylaw 1-3-(b), page 30, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(b) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of football during the month of November the period between October 1 and December 1 and for two weeks in May (May 7-21)."

Source: All nine members of the Western Athletic Conference.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I-A (48-61), I-AA and II.

NO. 49 BASKETBALL RECRUITING AND EVALUATION SEASONS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(5), page 56, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(5) Such contacts are permissible in the sport of basketball only during the period between September 17 and October 10 7 and the period between March 1 *(or the date of the completion of the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college contest, if it occurs thereafter)* and May 15, and the Saturday following the initial day for the spring signing of the National Letter of Intent in the sport of basketball, except as prohibited by Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(6)."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3-(a), page 59, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(a) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of basketball between June 15 and August 1 July 10 and July 31, between December 11 and December 31, and the period between the prospective student-athlete's initial and final high school or junior college contests between February 8 and the last day of February."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Council Subcommittee to Review the Recruiting Process).

Intent: To limit the contact and evaluation periods in the sport of basketball as set forth in the proposal.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II as amended by No. 49-1.

NO. 49-1 BASKETBALL RECRUITING AND EVALUATION SEASONS

Amend Proposal No. 49-B, Bylaw 1-3-(a), page 30, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(a) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of basketball between July 10 and July 31, between December 11 and December 31, and between February 8 and the last day of February. **In those states that play the high school basketball season in the fall, such scouting activities shall be permissible between July 10 and July 31, and between November 8 and November 28.**"

Source: University of Montana and Central Michigan University.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 50 COACHES' OUTSIDE COMPENSATION

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(g), page 18, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(g) Contractual agreements between a coach and an institution shall include the stipulation that a coach who is found in violation of NCAA regulations shall be subject to disciplinary or corrective action as set forth in the provisions of the NCAA enforcement procedure, **and shall include the stipulation that the coach annually shall report all athletically related income from sources outside the institution (including, but not limited to, income from annuities; sports camps; housing benefits; complimentary ticket sales; television and radio programs, and endorsement or consultation contracts with athletics shoe, apparel or equipment manufacturers) to the institution's chief executive officer.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Special Council Subcommittee to Review Coaches' Outside Income).

Intent: To fully inform an institution's chief executive officer regarding all athletically related income received by coaching staff members from sources outside the institution, without limiting the amount of such income.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved as amended by No. 50-3.

NO. 50-1 COACHES' OUTSIDE COMPENSATION

Amend Proposal No. 50, Constitution 3-2-(g), pages 30-31, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(g) Contractual agreements between a coach and an institution shall include the stipulation that a coach who is found in

violation of NCAA regulations shall be subject to disciplinary or corrective action as set forth in the provisions of the NCAA enforcement procedure, and shall include the stipulation that the coach annually shall report all athletically related *income from sources of income from outside of the institution* (including, but not limited to, *sources of income from such as: annuities; sports camps; housing benefits; complimentary ticket sales; television and radio programs, and endorsement or consultation contracts with athletics shoe, apparel or equipment manufacturers*) to the institution's chief executive officer."

Source: North Carolina State University.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 50-2 COACHES' OUTSIDE COMPENSATION

Amend Proposal No. 50, Constitution 3-2-(g), pages 30-31, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Effective Date: *Immediately August 1, 1987.*"

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 50-3 COACHES' OUTSIDE COMPENSATION

Amend Proposal No. 50, Constitution 3-2-(g), pages 30-31, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(g) Contractual agreements between a coach and an institution shall include the stipulation that a coach who is found in violation of NCAA regulations shall be subject to disciplinary or corrective action as set forth in the provisions of the NCAA enforcement procedure, and shall include the stipulation that the coach annually shall report all athletically related income from sources outside the institution (including, but not limited to, income from annuities; sports camps; housing benefits; complimentary ticket sales; television and radio programs, and endorsement or consultation contracts with athletics shoe, apparel or equipment manufacturers) **through the director of athletics** to the institution's chief executive officer."

Source: All 10 members of the Southeastern Conference.

Action: Approved.

NO. 51 INSTITUTIONAL ENDORSEMENT

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 6-(e), page 24, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(e) Staff members of member institutions and others serving on the Association's committees or acting as consultants shall not, directly or by implication, use the Association's name or their affiliation with the Association in the endorsement of products or services, **nor shall athletics department staff members, directly or by implication, use the institution's name or logo in**

the endorsement of commercial products or services for personal gain without prior approval from the institution."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Council Subcommittee to Review Coaches' Outside Income).

Intent: To prohibit the use of a member institution's name or logo in the endorsement of commercial products or services for personal gain by athletics department staff members without prior approval from the involved institution.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 52 ENDORSEMENT FUNDS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 6, page 25, by adding new paragraph (i), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(i) Staff members of a member institution's athletics department shall not accept, prior to receiving approval from the institution's chief executive officer, compensation or gratuities of any kind whatsoever, either directly or indirectly, excluding institutionally administered funds, from an athletics shoe, apparel or equipment manufacturer in exchange for the use of such merchandise during practice or competition by the institution's student-athletes."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Council Subcommittee to Review Coaches' Outside Income).

Intent: To require that an athletics department staff member obtain approval from the institution's chief executive officer before receiving compensation from athletics shoe, apparel or equipment manufacturers in exchange for the use of such merchandise during practice or competition by the institution's student-athletes.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 53 PERSONAL COMPENSATION

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 6, page 25, by adding new paragraph (j), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(j) Staff members of a member institution's athletics department shall not accept compensation or gratuities of any kind whatsoever, either directly or indirectly, for scheduling athletics contests or individual meet participation with another institution or sponsor of athletics competition. This specifically precludes the acceptance of compensation or gratuities from other institutions, schedule brokers or agents and television networks or syndicators."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Council Subcommittee to Review Coaches' Outside Income).

Intent: To prohibit personal gain by athletics department staff members for the scheduling of intercollegiate athletics contests or arranging for particular student-athletes to participate in an event.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 54 RESOLUTION: FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY

[Division I only]

"Whereas, there is substantial sentiment throughout the nation that freshmen should not be eligible for varsity competition in the sports of Division I-A football and Division I men's basketball; and

"Whereas, freshman eligibility is an academic matter and varsity competition in the sports of Division I-A football and Division I men's basketball represents activities that consume time, energy, effort and attention that might better be used in making the transition from home and high school to college and university, in personal and social ways, but especially academically; and

"Whereas, many believe that it would make eminently good sense to require at least one year of creditable academic performance toward graduation as a prerequisite to varsity eligibility in Division I-A football and Division I men's basketball; and

"Whereas, it is possible, even plausible, that top students as well as marginal students are distracted by freshman competition at the varsity level and thereby potentially impaired in their career development;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Convention express its view in principle that freshman eligibility should be eliminated in the sports of Division I-A football and Division I men's basketball, and that the matter should be referred to the NCAA Presidents Commission for the purpose of drafting specific legislation for the consideration of the Convention of the NCAA at its next meeting; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the Commission, in its drafting process, give consideration especially to the retention of academic standards and procedures that will encourage and stimulate academic performance in secondary schools; and

"Be It Finally Resolved, that this Association request that the NCAA Council assist the Presidents Commission in the drafting of the proposed specific legislation."

Source: University of California, Los Angeles; University of Maryland, College Park; University of Miami (Florida); University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, and North Carolina State University.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 55 ENFORCEMENT-PRELIMINARY INQUIRY

Enforcement Procedure: Amend Section 2-(b), page 217, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(b) The investigative staff, so far as practicable, shall make a

thorough investigation of all such charges that are received from responsible sources and are reasonably substantial. The investigative staff may conduct a preliminary inquiry for a reasonable period of time to determine whether there is adequate evidence to warrant an official inquiry; and in conducting this inquiry, the services of a field investigator may be used.

"(1) During the period of the preliminary inquiry, the investigative staff shall inform the involved institution of the general status of the inquiry not later than six months after the initial notice.

"(2) If the inquiry has not been processed to conclusion within one year of the date of the initial notice, the investigative staff shall review the status of the case with the Committee on Infractions. The committee shall determine whether further investigation is warranted, and its decision shall be forwarded to the involved institution in writing. If the investigation is continued, additional status reports shall be provided to the institution in writing at least every six months thereafter until the matter is concluded."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Intent: To require the enforcement staff to review with the Committee on Infractions the status of an investigation that has not been processed to conclusion at the end of one year, to authorize the committee to determine whether further investigation is warranted and to notify the involved institution, and to require additional status reports to the institution at six-month intervals thereafter.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 56 ENFORCEMENT-PREHEARING CASE SUMMARY

Enforcement Procedure: Amend Section 12-(b)-(6), page 231, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(6) Subsequent to reviewing an institution's submission of its written response to an official inquiry, in a case involving an alleged major violation:

"(i) The investigative staff shall prepare a summary statement of the case that identifies the individuals upon whom and the information upon which the staff will rely in presenting the case. This summary shall be provided to the members of the Committee on Infractions and to representatives of the institution and involved individuals prior to the hearing;

"(ii) Representatives of the involved individuals and institution may review in the NCAA national office those memorandums and documents upon which the inves-

tigative staff will rely in presenting the case to the committee, and

"(iii) The investigative staff may meet with institutional representatives in order to: (i) clarify the issues to be discussed in the case during the hearing, (ii) make suggestions regarding additional investigation or interviews that should be conducted by the institution to supplement its response and (iii) identify allegations that the staff intends to withdraw."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Intent: Once an institution's written response to an official inquiry has been submitted in cases involving allegations of major violations, to authorize the NCAA enforcement staff to prepare a summary statement for the Committee on Infractions (and others involved) of the information upon which it will rely in presenting the case and to permit representatives of the involved individuals and institution to review in the NCAA national office those memorandums and documents upon which the enforcement staff will rely in presenting the case to the committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 57 ENFORCEMENT-INFRACTIONS REPORTS

Enforcement Procedure: Amend Section 12-(d), page 233, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(d) **Confidential Infractions Reports**—The following procedures shall apply to *confidential infractions* reports.

"(1) Subsequent to an institutional hearing, the enforcement staff shall place in writing, under the direction of the chair, the findings of violations and penalty determined by the committee. Further, the staff may be authorized to draft the committee's reports required by the enforcement procedure. The *confidential infractions* report to an institution (required per Section 5) shall be subject to the approval of the chair (and, if necessary, the full committee). An expanded *confidential infractions* report (required per Section 6) upon appeal shall report the committee's actions and the reasons therefor and shall be subject to the committee's approval.

"(2) The committee's *confidential infractions* report (as described in Section 5) shall be forwarded to the involved institution under the chair's signature or under the signature of a committee member selected to act for the chair. Further, the report shall be sent by *certified mail, return-receipt requested overnight mail service*, and the enforcement staff shall confirm receipt by the institution in order that the 15-day appeal period applicable to this report may be established.

"(3) In the event an institution appeals any of the Committee on Infractions' findings of violations or penalty to the NCAA Council, a copy of the committee's expanded

confidential infractions report to the Council (as described in Section 6) shall be provided to the institution prior to the time of its appearance before the Council.

"(4) Once the infractions report or expanded infractions report has been received by the institution, the report, with names and other identifying information deleted, shall be made available to the national wire services and other media outlets."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Intent: To change the names of the "confidential" reports to "infractions" reports and to make the reports public once they have been transmitted to the involved institutions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 58 ENFORCEMENT—PUBLIC COMMENT

Enforcement Procedure: Amend Section 12-(a)-(15), page 230, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(15) The enforcement staff shall not confirm or deny the existence of an infractions case prior to complete resolution of the case through normal NCAA enforcement procedures. However, if the involved institution makes a public announcement concerning a case, the *executive director* enforcement staff may confirm the information made public by the institution and may correct erroneous or incomplete information about the investigation that has been made public by the institution."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Intent: To permit the enforcement staff to make public comments to correct erroneous or incomplete information made public by an institution that is the subject of an infractions case.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 59 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

A. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 2-(c)-(2), page 39, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(2) Employ an executive director, with the approval of the Council and the Presidents Commission, and employ such other persons as may be necessary to conduct efficiently the business of the Association;"

B. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 4-(d), page 42, by adding new subparagraph (8), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(8) Approve the appointment of an executive director of the Association."

Source: Duke University; University of Maryland, College Park; University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; North Carolina State University; University of Virginia, and Wake Forest University.

Intent: To give the Presidents Commission, in addition to the Council, the authority to approve the employment of an executive director.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 60 FINANCIAL AUDIT

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(c), page 17, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) All expenditures for or in behalf of an institution's intercollegiate athletics programs, including those by any outside organization, agency or group of individuals (two or more), shall be subject to an annual financial audit conducted for the institution by a qualified auditor who is not a staff member of the institution and who is selected either by the institution's chief executive officer or by an institutional administrator from outside the athletics department designated by the chief executive officer (in addition to any regular financial audit policies and procedures of the institution). The audit report shall be presented to the chief executive officer."

Source: University of Wisconsin, LaCrosse; University of Wisconsin, River Falls; University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point; University of Wisconsin, Stout; University of Wisconsin, Superior, and University of Wisconsin, Whitewater.

Intent: To eliminate the requirement that the annual financial audit be conducted by an outside individual or agency.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 61 FINANCIAL AUDIT

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(c), page 17, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) All expenditures for or in behalf of an institution's intercollegiate athletics programs, including those by an outside organization, agency or group of individuals (two or more), shall be subject to an annual financial audit conducted for the institution by a qualified auditor who is not a staff member of the institution and who is selected either by the institution's chief executive officer or by an institutional administrator from outside the athletics department designated by the chief executive officer (in addition to any regular financial audit policies and procedures of the institution). The audit report shall be presented to the chief executive officer. A member institution with an operating

budget for intercollegiate athletics of less than \$300,000 (excluding staff salaries), as verified in writing to the NCAA by the chief executive officer, shall be exempt from this legislation."

Source: All seven members of the Northern California Athletic Conference.

Intent: To exclude those member institutions with annual operating budgets for athletics of less than \$300,000 (excluding staff salaries) from the required annual independent audit of the intercollegiate athletics program.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Approved.

Academics

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following Proposal Nos. 62, 63, 64, 65 and 66 for roll-call votes.]

NO. 62 ACADEMIC REPORTING

Bylaws: Amend Bylaw 5, Section 6-(e), pages 113-114, as follows:

[Division I only]

[Subparagraphs (1), (2) and (3) unchanged.]

"(4) The institution's graduation rate for recruited student-athletes in each sport and the graduation rate for students generally for the entering freshman class that began attendance as full-time, regularly matriculated, degree-seeking students at the institution six years prior to the regular fall term that includes the October 1 deadline established in paragraph (e). For purposes of this legislation, the 'graduation rate' shall be based upon the number of students who entered the member institution with no previous collegiate attendance and graduated from that institution within five academic years of the date of initial enrollment. *Transfer students (from two-year or four-year colleges) shall be included in the graduation-rate calculations as a part of the class that had completed a number of terms equal to the number of terms of full-time collegiate attendance that the transfer student had completed prior to the transfer to the certifying institution. Students who transferred from the institution while in good academic standing and having met the satisfactory-progress requirements for athletics eligibility if the student had returned for the following academic year shall not be included;*

"(5) The institution's adjusted graduation rate for recruited student-athletes in each sport. In calculating the adjusted graduation rate, transfer student-athletes shall be included as a part of the class that had completed degree credit equivalent to the degree credit completed by the transfer student-athletes and accepted by the certifying institution at the time of transfer. Student-athletes who left the institution while in good academic standing and having met the satisfactory-progress requirements for athletics

eligibility if the student-athlete had returned for the following academic year shall not be included. Student-athletes who did not graduate within the specified five-year period but continue to be enrolled as full-time students at the same institution and maintain satisfactory progress toward a specific baccalaureate degree also shall not be included;

"(5) (6) Identification of the specific baccalaureate degree programs of studies pursued by the student-athletes included in the graduation-rate information under subparagraph (4) (5) who graduated, and an indication of the number that obtained a degree in each of those programs."

[Subparagraphs (6) and (7), renumbered as (7) and (8), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Intent: To modify Division I academic-reporting requirements to require graduation rates for students generally to be based upon the percentage of freshmen enrolled at the institution during a particular academic year who graduated from that institution within a five-year period and to include transfer students only in the calculation of an adjusted graduation rate for student-athletes in each sport.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I (roll-call vote; 202-93. See Appendix B) as amended by No. 62-1.

NO. 62-1 ACADEMIC REPORTING

Amend Proposal No. 62, Bylaw 5-6-(e), pages 37-38, as follows:

[Division I only]

[Subparagraphs (1), (2), (3) and (4) unchanged.]

"(5) The institution's adjusted graduation rate for recruited student-athletes in each sport. In calculating the adjusted graduation rate, transfer student-athletes shall be included as a part of the class that had completed degree credit equivalent to the degree credit completed by the transfer student-athletes and accepted by the certifying institution at the time of transfer. Student-athletes who left the institution while in good academic standing and having met the satisfactory-progress requirements for athletics eligibility if the student-athlete had returned for the following academic year shall not be included. Student-athletes who did not graduate within the specified five-year period but continue to be enrolled as full-time students at the same institution and maintain satisfactory progress toward a specific baccalaureate degree also shall not be included;"

[NOTE: The remainder of the proposal is unchanged.]

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 63 BYLAW 5-1-(j)—ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(2), page 97, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(2) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated as a nonqualifier in a Division I institution and whose matriculation was solicited per O.I. 100 shall not be eligible for financial aid, regular-season competition and practice during the first academic year in residence, except that a high school graduate who presents an overall accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 but who fails to present the required grade-point average in the core curriculum and achieve the required test score may receive financial aid based upon institutional and conference regulations and, if the individual receives financial aid, shall be charged with the loss of one of the four seasons of eligibility permitted under Bylaw 5-1-(d). A nonqualifier or partial qualifier shall be entitled to three seasons of eligibility per Bylaw 5-1-(d) subsequent to the initial year of residence at the certifying institution."

Source: University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Pennsylvania State University; University of Texas, El Paso; Texas Christian University; Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and West Virginia University.

Intent: To specify that a nonqualifier or partial qualifier shall be entitled to three seasons of eligibility regardless of the individual's financial aid status during the first year of residence at the certifying institution.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Approved by Division I (roll-call vote; 235-68. See Appendix B).

NO. 64 ELIGIBILITY—INITIAL QUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j), pages 95-101, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(j) The student-athlete shall conform to the following eligibility provisions for all championships and in Divisions I and II for regular-season competition, practice and athletically related financial aid as indicated.

"[Note: A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and at the time of graduation from high school:

"(i) Presented an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 11 academic courses, including at least three years in English, two years in mathematics, two years in social science and two years in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory class, if offered by the high school) as certified on the high school transcript or by official correspondence,

as well as a 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections or a 15 composite score on the ACT.

"(ii) Presented more than the minimum standard set forth in the preceding paragraph for either the core-curriculum grade-point average or required test score, in which case eligibility may be established during the specified time periods on the basis of the following eligibility indices:

"For those freshmen entering subsequent to August 1, 1987, and prior to August 1, 1988:

GPA	SAT	ACT
2.100-above	680	14
2.000-2.099	700	15
1.900-1.999	720	16

"An exception may be granted by the NCAA Eligibility Committee for a student who left high school after completion of the junior year or during the senior year to enter a member institution under an early admissions program open to students solely on the basis of outstanding academic performance and promise, and provided that for the last four semesters completed in high school, the student maintained an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 3.500 (based on a maximum of 4.000) and ranked in the top 20 percent of the student's class, and that the student met all requirements of a qualifier except graduation from high school.]

"(1) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated as a qualifier in a Division I or Division II institution shall be eligible for financial aid, regular-season competition and practice based only upon institutional and conference regulations.

"(2) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated as a nonqualifier in a Division I or Division II institution and whose matriculation was solicited per O.I. 100 shall not be eligible for financial aid, regular-season competition and practice during the first academic year in residence, except that a high school graduate who presents an overall accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 but who fails to present the required grade-point average in the core curriculum and achieve the required test score may receive financial aid based upon institutional and conference regulations and, if the individual receives financial aid, shall be charged with the loss of one of the four seasons of eligibility permitted under Bylaw 5-1-(d).

"(3) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated as a nonqualifier in a Division I or Division II institution and whose matriculation was not solicited per O.I. 100 shall not be eligible

for regular-season competition and practice during the first academic year in residence; however, such a student whose admission and financial aid were granted without regard in any degree to athletic ability shall be eligible for nonathletic financial aid, provided there is on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty representative, the admissions officer and the chair of the financial aid committee that admission and financial aid were so granted.

"(4) A transfer student from a four-year institution, who was a qualifier or a nonqualifier and who attended a four-year institution at least one academic year, shall be eligible for financial aid, regular-season competition and practice in a Division I or Division II institution under the rules of the institution and the conference of which the institution is a member.

"(5) A transfer student from a four-year institution who was a nonqualifier and attended the four-year institution less than one full academic year shall not be eligible for financial aid, regular-season competition and practice in a Division I or Division II institution during the first academic year in attendance at the certifying institution."

[Subparagraphs (6) and (7) unchanged.]

"(8) A transfer student from a junior college who was a qualifier is not eligible in Division I or Division II institutions for any NCAA championships the first academic year in residence unless the student has:

"(i) Graduated from the junior college and has satisfactorily completed a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution, or

"(ii) Presented a minimum of 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000, satisfactorily completed an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution during each academic term of attendance and spent at least two semesters or three quarters in residence at the junior college (excluding summer sessions).

"(9) A transfer student from a junior college who was a nonqualifier is not eligible in Division I or Division II institutions for financial aid, practice, regular-season competition and for any NCAA championships the first academic year in residence unless the student has graduated from the junior college and has satisfactorily

completed a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution.

"(10) A transfer student from a junior college is not eligible in Divisions II and III institutions for any NCAA championships the first academic year in residence unless the student has:

"(i) Graduated from the junior college, or

"(ii) Presented a minimum of 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 and spent at least two semesters or three quarters in residence at the junior college (excluding summer sessions)."

Source: NCAA Presidents Commission (All members of the California Collegiate Athletic Association, Lone Star Conference and Sunshine State Conference).

Intent: To require the same minimum academic standards for initial athletics eligibility in Division II as are currently required in Division I.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Approved by Division II (roll-call vote; 93-70. See Appendix B) as amended by No. 64-2.

NO. 64-1 ELIGIBILITY-INITIAL QUALIFIER

Amend Proposal No. 64, Bylaw 5-1-(j), pages 39-42, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(j) The student-athlete shall conform to the following eligibility provisions for all championships and in Divisions I and II for regular-season competition; practice and athletically related financial aid as indicated.

"[Note: A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and at the time of graduation from high school:

"(i) Presented an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 11 academic courses, including at least three years in English, two years in mathematics, two years in social science and two years in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory class, if offered by the high school) as certified on the high school transcript or by official correspondence, as well as a 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections or a 15 composite score on the ACT.

"(ii) Presented more than the minimum standard set forth in the preceding paragraph for either the core curriculum grade-point average or required test score, in which case eligibility may be established during the

specified time periods on the basis of the following eligibility indices:

"For those freshmen entering subsequent to August 1, 1987, and prior to August 1, 1988:

CPA	SAT	ACT
2.100-above	680	14
2.000-2.099	700	15
1.900-1.999	720	16

"An exception may be granted by the NCAA Eligibility Committee for a student who left high school after completion of the junior year or during the senior year to enter a member institution under an early admissions program open to students solely on the basis of outstanding academic performance and promise, and provided that for the last four semesters completed in high school, the student maintained an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 3.500 (based on a maximum of 4.000) and ranked in the top 20 percent of the student's class, and that the student met all requirements of a qualifier except graduation from high school."

[NOTE: The remainder of the proposal is unchanged.]

Source: All 14 members of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association and eight members of the Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association.

Action: Defeated by Division II (63-100).

NO. 64-2 ELIGIBILITY-INITIAL QUALIFIER

Amend Proposal No. 64, Bylaw 5-1-(j), pages 39-42, as follows:

[Division II only]

"Effective Date: August 1, 1987 **August 1, 1988.**"

Source: All 14 members of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association and all eight members of the Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association.

Action: Approved by Division II.

NO. 65 ELIGIBILITY-INITIAL QUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j), pages 95-98, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(j) The student-athlete shall conform to the following eligibility provisions for all championships and in Divisions I and II for regular-season competition, practice and athletically related financial aid as indicated.

"[Note: A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and at the time of graduation from high school:

"(i) Presented an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 11 academic courses including at least three years in English, two years in mathematics, two years in social science and two years in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory

class, if offered by the high school) as certified on the high school transcript or by official correspondence, as well as a 600 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections or a 12 composite score on the ACT.

"(ii) Presented more than the minimum standard set forth in the preceding paragraph for either the core-curriculum grade-point average or required test score, in which case eligibility may be established during the specified time periods on the basis of the following eligibility indices:

"For those freshmen entering subsequent to August 1, 1987, and prior to August 1, 1988:

GPA	SAT	ACT
2.200-above	560	10
2.100-2.199	580	11
2.000-2.099	600	12
1.900-1.999	630	13
1.800-1.899	670	14

"For those freshmen entering subsequent to August 1, 1988, and prior to August 1, 1989:

GPA	SAT	ACT
2.100-above	580	11
2.000-2.099	600	12
1.900-1.999	630	13

"For those freshmen entering subsequent to August 1, 1989:

GPA	SAT	ACT
2.000	600	12

"An exception may be granted by the NCAA Eligibility Committee for a student who left high school after completion of the junior year or during the senior year to enter a member institution under an early admissions program open to students solely on the basis of outstanding academic performance and promise, and provided that for the last four semesters completed in high school, the student maintained an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 3.500 (based on a maximum of 4.000) and ranked in the top 20 percent of the student's class, and that the student met all requirements of a qualifier except graduation from high school.]

"(1) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated as a qualifier in a Division I or Division II institution shall be eligible for financial aid, regular-season competition and practice based only upon institutional and conference regulations.

"(2) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated as a nonqualifier in a Division I or Division II institution and whose matricu-

lation was solicited per O.I. 100 shall not be eligible for financial aid, regular-season competition and practice during the first academic year in residence, except that a high school graduate who presents an overall accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 but who fails to present the required grade-point average in the core curriculum and achieve the required test score may receive financial aid based upon institutional and conference regulations and, if the individual receives financial aid, shall be charged with the loss of one of the four seasons of eligibility permitted under Bylaw 5-1-(d).

"(3) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated as a nonqualifier in a Division I or Division II institution and whose matriculation was not solicited per O.I. 100 shall not be eligible for regular-season competition and practice during the first academic year in residence; however, such a student whose admission and financial aid were granted without regard in any degree to athletic ability shall be eligible for nonathletic financial aid, provided there is on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty representative, the admissions officer and the chair of the financial aid committee that admission and financial aid were so granted.

"(4) A transfer student from a four-year institution, who was a qualifier or a nonqualifier and who attended a four-year institution at least one academic year, shall be eligible for financial aid, regular-season competition and practice in a Division I or Division II institution under the rules of the institution and the conference of which the institution is a member.

"(5) A transfer student from a four-year institution who was a nonqualifier and attended the four-year institution less than one full academic year shall not be eligible for financial aid, regular-season competition and practice in a Division I or Division II institution during the first academic year in attendance at the certifying institution."

Source: All nine members of the Gulf South Conference.

Intent: To require minimum academic standards for initial athletics eligibility in Division II similar to those currently required in Division I, but with less stringent core-curriculum grade-point average and test-score indices and without affecting current Division II requirements for junior college transfer students.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Moot due to adoption of No. 64.

NO. 66 ELIGIBILITY—INITIAL QUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j), pages 95-101, as follows:
[Division II only]

"(j) The student-athlete shall conform to the following eligibility provisions for all championships and in Divisions I and II for regular-season competition, practice and athletically related financial aid as indicated.

"[Note: A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and at the time of graduation from high school presented an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 11 academic courses including at least three years in English, two years in mathematics, two years in social science and two years in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory class, if offered by the high school) as certified on the high school transcript or by official correspondence. An exception may be granted by the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee for a student who left high school after completion of the junior year or during the senior year to enter a member institution under an early admissions program open to students solely on the basis of outstanding academic performance and promise, and provided that for the last four semesters completed in high school, the student maintained an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 3.500 (based on a maximum of 4.000) and ranked in the top 20 percent of the student's class and that the student met all requirements of a qualifier except graduation from high school.]

"(1) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated as a qualifier in a Division I or Division II institution shall be eligible for financial aid, regular-season competition and practice based only upon institutional and conference regulations.

"(2) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated as a nonqualifier in a Division I or Division II institution and whose matriculation was solicited per O.I. 100 shall not be eligible for financial aid, regular-season competition and practice during the first academic year in residence.

"(3) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated as a nonqualifier in a Division I or Division II institution and whose matriculation was not solicited per O.I. 100 shall not be eligible for regular-season competition and practice during the first academic year in residence; however, such a student whose admission and financial aid were granted without regard in any degree to athletic ability shall be eligible for nonathletic financial aid, provided there is

on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty representative, the admissions officer and the chair of the financial aid committee that admission and financial aid were so granted.

"(4) A transfer student from a four-year institution, who was a qualifier or a nonqualifier and who attended a four-year institution at least one academic year, shall be eligible for financial aid, regular-season competition and practice in a Division I or Division II institution under the rules of the institution and the conference of which the institution is a member.

"(5) A transfer student from a four-year institution who was a nonqualifier and attended the four-year institution less than one full academic year shall not be eligible for financial aid, regular-season competition and practice in a Division I or Division II institution during the first academic year in attendance at the certifying institution."

[Subparagraphs (6) and (7) unchanged.]

"(8) A transfer student from a junior college who was a qualifier is not eligible in Division I or Division II institutions for any NCAA championships the first academic year in residence unless the student has:

"(i) Graduated from the junior college and has satisfactorily completed a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution, or

"(ii) Presented a minimum of 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000, satisfactorily completed an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution during each academic term of attendance and spent at least two semesters or three quarters in residence at the junior college (excluding summer sessions).

"(9) A transfer student from a junior college who was a nonqualifier is not eligible in Division I or Division II institutions for financial aid, practice, regular-season competition and for any NCAA championships the first academic year in residence unless the student has graduated from the junior college and has satisfactorily completed a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution.

"(10) A transfer student from a junior college is not eligible in Divisions II and III institutions for any NCAA championships the first academic year in residence unless the student has:

"(i) Graduated from the junior college, or

"(ii) Presented a minimum of 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 and spent at least two semesters or three quarters in residence at the junior college (excluding summer sessions)."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To require minimum academic standards for initial athletics eligibility in Division II similar to those currently required in Division I, but with no test-score requirement or partial-qualifier provision.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Moot due to adoption of No. 64.

NO. 67 ELIGIBILITY—INITIAL QUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend note following Bylaw 5-1-(j), pages 96-97, as follows:
[Division I only]

"[Note: A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and at the time of graduation from high school who:

"(i) Presented an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 11 academic courses including at least three years in English, two years in mathematics, two years in social science and two years in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory class, if offered by the high school) at the time of graduation from high school as certified on the high school transcript or by official correspondence, as well as a 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections or a 15 composite score on the ACT. The minimum required SAT or ACT score must be achieved no later than the July 1 immediately preceding the individual's first enrollment in a collegiate institution."

[Subparagraph (ii) and remainder of note unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit the SAT or ACT score used for establishing initial athletics eligibility under Bylaw 5-1-(j) to be achieved no later than the July 1 immediately preceding the student's initial enrollment in a collegiate institution.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 68 INITIAL QUALIFIER—OUTSIDE PARTICIPATION

Bylaws: Amend Situation 645, page 16, The NCAA News, October 20, 1986, relating to Bylaws 5-1-(j) and 5-1-(j)-(2), as follows:

[Division I only]

"Situation 645: A partial qualifier or a nonqualifier under the provisions of Bylaw 5-1-(j) is not eligible to participate in intercollegiate competition during the initial year of enrollment at a Division I member institution.

"Question: May such an individual participate on an outside sports team during this initial year of enrollment?

"Answer: No. A partial qualifier or nonqualifier would be permitted to participate in the institution's intramural program (so long as the intramural team is not coached by a member of the institution's athletics department staff), but it would not be permissible for such an individual to participate during the first year of enrollment in athletics competition on *an institutional club team or an outside sports team.*"

Source: All eight members of the Ivy Group.

Intent: To permit partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers to participate on institutional club teams during the initial year of enrollment at a Division I member institution.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 69 ELIGIBILITY—INITIAL QUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend note following Bylaw 5-1-(j), pages 96-97, as follows:

[Division I only]

"[Note: A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and at the time of graduation from high school:

[Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) unchanged.]

"An exception may be granted by the NCAA Eligibility Committee for a student who left high school after completion of the junior year or during the senior year to enter a member institution under an early admissions program open to students solely on the basis of outstanding academic performance and promise, and provided that for the last four semesters completed in high school, the student maintained an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 3.500 (based on a maximum of 4.000) and ranked in the top 20 percent of the student's class, and that the student met all requirements of a qualifier except graduation from high school. **Until August 1, 1987, a student educated in secondary school outside the United States and who satisfies the grade-point and core-curriculum requirements, and who is admitted under an institutional admissions procedure that does not require the ACT or SAT for such students generally and has**

not taken either test prior to initial enrollment, may satisfy the ACT/SAT requirement on a score from taking the test at the first local, regularly scheduled opportunity after initial enrollment.]"

Source: All eight members of the Ivy Group.

Intent: To provide an additional testing opportunity for student-athletes educated in secondary school outside the United States in the circumstances set forth in the proposal.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I (166-134).

NO. 70 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(6), pages 98-99, by adding new subparagraph (iv), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(iv) The student-athlete must have earned the following accumulative minimum grade-point average (based on a maximum of 4.000) to be eligible for: (1) a first season of competition after the freshman year in any sport—1.700; (2) a second season of competition after the freshman year in any sport—1.850; (3) a third and fourth season of competition after the freshman year in any sport—2.000."

Source: All 10 members of the Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To establish qualitative academic progress requirements for eligibility.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Defeated by Division I (130-176).

NO. 71 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(6)-(ii), page 98, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(ii) Eligibility for regular-season competition subsequent to the student-athlete's first academic year in residence or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in a sport shall be based upon: (1) satisfactory completion prior to each term in which a season of competition begins of an accumulative total of semester or quarter hours of academic credit that is equivalent to the completion of an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours during each of the previous academic terms in academic years in which the student-athlete has been enrolled in a term or terms, or (2) satisfactory completion of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of academic credit since the beginning of the student-athlete's last season of competition. For purposes of this provision, a student-athlete shall meet the 'satisfactory completion' requirement by maintaining a grade-point average that places the stu-

dent-athlete in good academic standing as established by the institution for all students who are at an equivalent stage of progress toward a degree. **In no event shall a student who is in good academic standing be denied eligibility because of an academic-credit total attributable to not having been enrolled in any term or terms.**"

Source: All eight members of the Ivy Group.

Intent: To permit a student-athlete who is considered by the certifying institution to be in good academic standing to avoid ineligibility under the satisfactory-progress rule that might result from missed terms of attendance.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 72 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(6)-(ii), page 98, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(ii) Eligibility for regular-season competition subsequent to the student-athlete's first academic year in residence or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in a sport shall be based upon: (1) satisfactory completion prior to each term in which a season of competition begins of an accumulative total of semester or quarter hours of academic credit **acceptable toward a baccalaureate degree in a designated program of studies at the institution** that is equivalent to the completion of an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours during each of the previous academic terms in academic years in which the student-athlete has been enrolled in a term or terms, or (2) satisfactory completion of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of *academic degree* credit, **acceptable toward a baccalaureate degree in a designated program of studies at the institution**, since the beginning of the student-athlete's last season of competition in that sport or since the beginning of the institution's last season of competition in that sport. For purposes of this provision, a student-athlete shall meet the 'satisfactory completion' requirement by maintaining a grade-point average that places the student-athlete in good academic standing as established by the institution for all students who are at an equivalent stage of progress toward a degree."

Source: Canisius College, East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania, Gannon University, Hofstra University, Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania, West Chester University of Pennsylvania and 36 other members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit a student-athlete who has completed 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of academic credit acceptable toward a degree since the beginning of the institution's last season of competition in the sport involved to be eligible under the requirements of the satisfactory-progress rule, retaining the alternative opportunity for the student-athlete to establish eligibility by completing 24

semester or 36 quarter hours since the beginning of the individual's last season of competition.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 73 ACADEMIC REPORTING

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 6-(e), pages 113-114, by adding new subparagraph (8), as follows:

[Division I only]

"(8) By a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, the Council may modify the specific requirements of subparagraphs (1) through (5) above to conform more closely to member institutions' established methods for compiling reliable data concerning admissions standards, academic progress and graduation rates."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To authorize the Council to modify Division I academic-reporting requirements in keeping with established institutional methods for compiling information concerning admissions standards, academic progress and graduation rates.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

Recruiting

NO. 74 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(1)-(i) and (ii), page 55, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(i) In sports other than football and basketball in Division I and in all sports in Division II, three additional in-person, off-campus contacts per prospect shall be permitted by each member institution on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution and with the approval of that institution's executive officer or the executive officer's designated representative.

"(ii) In Division I-A and Division I-AA football and Division I basketball only, one additional in-person, off-campus contact per prospect shall be permitted during each week of the appropriate contact period by each member institution on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution and with the approval of that institution's executive officer or the executive officer's designated representative; however, a member institution may visit a prospect's educational institution on no more than one occasion during a particular week, regardless of the total number of recruited prospects enrolled in the same institution."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Council Subcommittee to Review the Recruiting Process).

Intent: To permit each Division I member institution to visit a basketball prospect's educational institution only once each week for recruiting contact purposes.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 75 RECRUITING-FOOTBALL CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(1)-(ii), page 55, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

"(ii) In Division I-A and Division I-AA football only, one additional in-person, off-campus contact per prospect shall be permitted during each week of the appropriate contact period by each member institution on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution and with the approval of that institution's executive officer or the executive officer's designated representative; however, a member institution may visit a prospect's educational institution on no more than one occasion during a particular week and **during the same year on no more than three occasions totally after January 1**, regardless of the total number of recruited prospects enrolled in the same institution."

Source: University of Arizona; Arizona State University; University of California, Berkeley; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; University of Southern California, and three other members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To permit only three contact visits during the same year to the high school after January 1, including not more than one in any one week, by a member institution's football coaches.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 76 LETTER OF INTENT-INITIAL QUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a), page 56, by adding new subparagraph (2), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(2) Prior to signing a prospective student-athlete in the National Letter of Intent's early signing program, a Division I member institution's director of admissions must verify that:

"(i) The prospective student-athlete has successfully completed eight or more of the core-curriculum subjects required per Bylaw 5-1-(j) with a minimum 2.000 grade-point average and shows evidence of successfully completing by graduation the 11 required core-curriculum

subjects with a minimum 2.000 grade-point average, and

"(ii) The prospective student-athlete has attained a minimum 700 SAT score or 15 ACT score."

Source: Boston College, Bowling Green State University, University of Miami (Florida), Georgia Institute of Technology, St. John's University and Vanderbilt University.

Intent: To require evidence that a prospective student-athlete has made substantial progress toward meeting the requirements of Bylaw 5-1-(j) before the prospect may be signed in the early letter-of-intent program.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Defeated by Division I after motion was approved to vote separately on subparagraphs (i) and (ii); both were defeated.

NO. 77 LETTER OF INTENT-WOMEN'S BASKETBALL

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(6)-(ii), page 57, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(6) There shall be no on- or off-campus, in-person contacts by any institutional staff member or representative of an institution's athletics interests during the following time periods:

[Subparagraph (i) unchanged.]

"(ii) In the sport of women's basketball, during the period beginning with the Wednesday prior to the National Collegiate Division I Women's Basketball Championship game and ending at noon on the Monday after the game, **and during the period 48 hours prior to and 48 hours after the 8 a.m. spring National Letter of Intent initial signing time. The National Letter of Intent cannot be hand-delivered during this latter period; it must be mailed.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(6), page 57, by adding new subparagraph (ii), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs:

[Division II only]

"(6) There shall be no on- or off-campus, in-person contacts by any institutional staff member or representative of an institution's athletics interests during the following time periods:

[Subparagraph (i) unchanged.]

"(ii) In the sport of women's basketball, during the period 48 hours prior to and 48 hours after the 8 a.m. spring National Letter of Intent initial signing time. **The National Letter of Intent cannot be hand-delivered during this period; it must be mailed.**"

Source: Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania; University of New Hampshire; Pennsylvania State University; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; University of Texas, Austin; University of Texas, San Antonio, and seven other member institutions.

Intent: To establish a quiet period surrounding the first opportunity to sign a spring national letter of intent in women's basketball and to require that any letter of intent received by the women's basketball prospect during this period be mailed.

Effective Date: September 1, 1987.

Action: Approved by Division I and defeated by Division II (77-82).
Later motion to reconsider in Division I defeated.

NO. 78 FOOTBALL RECRUITING

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(6), pages 56-57, as follows:
[Division II football only]

"(6) There shall be no on- or off-campus, in-person contacts by any institutional staff member or representative of an institution's athletics interests during the following time periods:

[Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) unchanged.]

"(iii) In the sport of football, during the period beginning at 12:01 a.m. on the day of registration at the annual convention of the American Football Coaches Association and ending at 12:01 a.m. on the day after the completion of that convention."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(6), pages 56-57, as follows:
[Division III football only]

"(6) There shall be no on- or off-campus, in-person contacts by any institutional staff member or representative of an institution's athletics interests during the following time periods:

[Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) unchanged.]

"(iii) In the sport of football, during the period beginning at 12:01 a.m. on the day of registration at the annual convention of the American Football Coaches Association and ending at 12:01 a.m. on the day after the completion of that convention."

Source: Augustana College (Illinois), Buena Vista College, Ithaca College, Mankato State University, San Francisco State University, Towson State University and 49 other member institutions.

Intent: To prohibit any in-person, on- or off-campus recruiting by an institutional staff member or representative of an institution's athletics interests during the annual convention of the American Football Coaches Association.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Divisions II and III.

NO. 79 WOMEN'S SOFTBALL RECRUITING

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(6), page 57, by adding new subparagraph (vii), as follows:

[Division I only]

"(6) There shall be no on- or off-campus, in-person contacts by any institutional staff member or representative of an institution's athletics interests during the following time periods:

[Subparagraphs (i) through (vi) unchanged.]

"(vii) In the sport of softball, during the period beginning with the Tuesday prior to the National Collegiate Division I Women's Softball Championship game and ending at noon on the Monday after the game."

Source: All nine members of the Mid-American Conference.

Intent: To prohibit in-person, on- or off-campus recruiting in the sport of softball by a member of a Division I coaching staff during the final round of the Division I Women's Softball Championship.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 80 RECRUITING-BASKETBALL EVALUATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3-(a), page 59, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(a) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of basketball during the period between June 15 and August 1 and the period between the prospective student-athlete's initial and final high school or junior college contests. Institutional staff members shall be limited to observing a maximum of four basketball contests in which a prospective student-athlete competes during any academic year. Observing a contest shall count as one of the four permissible observations of each prospective student-athlete on both teams."

Source: University of Arizona; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; University of Southern California, and 10 other member institutions.

Intent: To limit to four the maximum number of high school or junior college basketball games (in which a prospect competes) that a member institution may observe during any academic year.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II. Originally withdrawn but later considered.

NO. 81 RECRUITING-FOOTBALL EVALUATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3-(b), page 59, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A, I-AA and II football, divided vote]

"(b) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of football during the period between August 1 and December 1 (or the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college contest) only on Thursdays and Fridays, as well as the month of May."

Source: University of California, Berkeley; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; University of Southern California; University of Washington; Washington State University, and two other members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To limit recruiting evaluation visits to the high school or junior college during the football season to Thursday and Friday of each week.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 82 RECRUITING—FOOTBALL EVALUATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3-(b), page 59, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A, I-AA and II football, divided vote]

“(b) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of football during the period between August 1 and December 1 (or the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college contest), as well as the month of May period beginning May 10 and ending May 31.”

Source: University of California, Los Angeles; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; University of Southern California; Stanford University; Washington State University, and two other members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To limit the spring football evaluation period to the last three weeks of May.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Moot due to adoption of No. 48.

NO. 83 EVALUATION PERIODS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3, page 59, by adding new paragraph (d), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

“(d) These limitations shall not be applicable to a coaching staff member who is the parent (or legal guardian) of a participant in the high school, junior college or all-star contest being observed, provided the attendance by the coaching staff member at such a contest does not involve any personal contact with any other participant in the contest.”

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To provide an exemption from the evaluation periods for coaches who are parents of prospective student-athletes participating in the football or basketball competition being observed.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 84 RECRUITING—OFFICIAL VISITS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 9-(b), page 65, as follows:

[Division I only]

“(b) Division I—There shall be a limit on the total number of paid visits an institution may provide prospective student-athletes in the following sports during an academic year: Football—95 80; Basketball—18 15. The institutions must maintain a written record of the paid visits of prospective student-athletes pursuant to this paragraph. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to this regulation for institutions that have suffered extraordinary personnel losses from one or more of their intercollegiate athletics teams due to accident or illness of a disastrous nature.”

Source: University of Arizona; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; Oregon State University; University of Southern California; Stanford University, and two other members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To reduce the number of paid recruiting visits provided by a Division I institution in the sports of football (95 to 80) and basketball (18 to 15).

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 85 RECRUITING—OFFICIAL VISITS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 9-(e), page 66, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

“(e) Divisions I and II—A prospect in the sports of football, basketball or women's volleyball may accept not more than one expense-paid visit to not more than five member institutions. A prospect in any other sport may not accept more than one expense-paid visit to not more than three member institutions. Each Division I or II member institution shall be required to notify in writing, at the time of its invitation, each prospective student-athlete whom it invites to receive an expense-paid visit of the limitations imposed by this bylaw; further, that invitation and notification shall occur at least five calendar days in advance of the visit.”

Source: University of Oregon, Oregon State University, University of Southern California, Stanford University, University of Washington, Washington State University and three other members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To reduce from five to three the number of paid visits a prospect may accept in sports other than football, basketball and women's volleyball.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 86 SELF-FINANCED VISITS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 9-(f), pages 66-67, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(f) A prospective student-athlete may visit a member institution's campus at the prospect's own expense as often as the prospect wishes. During each such visit, the institution may not pay any expense or provide any entertainment except a maximum of three complimentary admissions **issued only through a pass list** to a campus athletics event in which the institution's intercollegiate team competes, for the exclusive use of the prospective student-athlete and those persons accompanying the prospect on the visit, and transportation, when accompanied by an institutional staff member, only to view off-campus practice and competition sites within a 30-mile radius of the institution's campus. In addition, a Division II or III member institution may provide a meal in the institution's on-campus student dining facilities during such a visit. Payment of any expenses or providing any entertainment, except as noted, on such a trip shall constitute an expense-paid trip."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Council Subcommittee to Review the Recruiting Process).

Intent: To require that complimentary admissions for prospective student-athletes on self-financed visits be administered through a pass list.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 87 SELF-FINANCED VISITS—DIVISION III

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 9-(f), page 67, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(f) A prospective student-athlete may visit a member institution's campus at the prospect's own expense as often as the prospect wishes. During each such visit, the institution may not pay any expense or provide any entertainment except a maximum of three complimentary admissions to a campus athletics event in which the institution's intercollegiate team competes, for the exclusive use of the prospective student-athlete and those persons accompanying the prospect on the visit, and transportation, when accompanied by an institutional staff member, only to view off-campus practice and competition sites within a 30-mile radius of the institution's campus. In addition, a Division II or III member institution may provide a meal in the institution's on-campus student dining facilities during such a visit. **Further, a Division III member institution may provide housing during such a visit, provided that such housing is generally available from the institution to all visiting prospective students.** Payment of any expenses or providing any entertainment, except as noted, on such a trip shall constitute an expense-paid trip."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To allow Division III member institutions to provide housing to a prospective student-athlete during a self-financed campus visit, provided such housing generally is available from the institution to all visiting prospective students.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division III.

NO. 88 RECRUITING—PRINTED RECRUITING AIDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(b)-(3), page 54, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(3) Institutions are permitted to provide **only** the following printed materials to prospective student-athletes:

"(i) Official academic, admissions and student-services publications published by the institution and available to all students;

"(ii) One annual athletics press guide (**which shall be of a size not to exceed 5½ by 9 inches, with only one color of printing inside the covers**) per sport;

"(iii) One annual athletics recruiting brochure (**which shall be of a size not to exceed 5½ by 9 inches, with only one color of printing inside the covers**) per sport;

"(iv) Game programs, and

"(v) One wallet-size playing schedule per sport."

Source: Arizona State University; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; Oregon State University; University of Southern California; Stanford University, and three other members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To require that all athletics press guides and athletics recruiting brochures meet the specifications described.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Approved by all divisions as amended by No. 88-1.

NO. 88-1 RECRUITING—PRINTED RECRUITING AIDS

Amend Proposal No. 88, Bylaw 1-1-(b)-(3), pages 57-58, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(3) Institutions are permitted to provide **only** the following printed materials to prospective student-athletes:

"(i) Official academic, admissions and student-services publications published by the institution and available to all students;

"(ii) One annual athletics press guide (*which shall be of a size not to exceed 5½ by 9 inches, with only one color of printing inside the covers*) per sport;

"(iii) One annual athletics recruiting brochure (*which shall*

be of a size not to exceed 5½ by 9 inches, with only one color of printing inside the covers) per sport;

"(iv) Game programs, and

"(v) One wallet-size playing schedule per sport."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 89 PRINTED RECRUITING AIDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(b)-(3), page 54, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(3) Institutions are permitted to provide the following printed materials to prospective student-athletes:

"(i) Official academic, admissions and student-services publications published by the institution and available to all students;

"(ii) One annual athletics press guide per sport;

"(iii) One annual athletics recruiting brochure or recruiting poster per sport;

"(iv) Game programs, and

"(v) One wallet-size playing schedule per sport."

Source: Bucknell University, Franklin and Marshall College, Hartwick College, Jersey City State College, Manhattan College, Union College and 73 other members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit member institutions to utilize one recruiting poster or poster-type brochure per sport as a recruiting aid for distribution to prospective student-athletes.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division III; defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 90 TRYOUT RULE-AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 6-(c)-(3), page 62, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(3) Regularly scheduled high school athletics contests or matches conducted by a member institution or sponsored jointly with an outside organization, held on the campus of a member institution, provided the opportunity to participate in the event is not limited to specific prospective student-athletes or high schools and all individual prospects or high schools in a specific geographical area are eligible to compete (limited only by number, high school classification or on the basis of some objective standard of performance), and provided the event appears on the high schools' schedules and has been approved prior to the sports season by the appropriate state high school authority or is conducted by a national sports federation of which this Association is a member, and provided no awards are presented to the participants;"

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Intent: To delete the prohibition against awards at high school athletics contests conducted by a member institution under the conditions prescribed in Bylaw 1-6-(c)-(3).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 91 TRYOUTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 6, pages 61-63, by deleting paragraphs (a) and (f) and substituting new paragraph (a), as follows:

[Division II only]

"(a) A Division II member institution may conduct a tryout of a prospective student-athlete only on its own campus and only under the following conditions:

"(1) No more than one tryout per prospective student-athlete per institution shall be permitted.

"(2) The tryout may be conducted only after the prospective student-athlete has completed high school eligibility in the sport or, for a junior college student, after the conclusion of the sport season.

"(3) A medical examination of a prospective student-athlete conducted by an institution's regular team physician or other designated physician shall be permitted as a part of the tryout.

"(4) The tryout may include tests to evaluate the prospective student-athlete's strength, speed, agility and sports skills. Except in the sports of football, wrestling, ice hockey and lacrosse, the tryout may include competition.

"(5) The time of tryout activities (other than the physical examination) shall be limited to the length of the institution's normal practice period in the sport, but shall in no event be longer than two hours.

"(6) The institution may provide equipment and clothing on an issuance-and-retrieval basis to a prospective student-athlete during the period of the tryout."

Source: Central Missouri State University; Lincoln University; University of Missouri, Rolla; Northeast Missouri State University; Northwest Missouri State University; Southeast Missouri State University, and one other member of the Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association.

Intent: To permit tryouts for prospective student-athletes at Division II member institutions under the limited circumstances set forth in the proposal.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division II. Originally withdrawn but later considered.

NO. 92 TRYOUTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 6, pages 61-63, by deleting paragraphs (a) and (f) and substituting new paragraph (a), as follows:

[Division II only]

"(a) A Division II member institution may conduct a tryout of a prospective student-athlete only on its campus and only under the following conditions:

"(1) No more than one tryout per prospective student-athlete per institution shall be permitted.

"(2) The tryout may be conducted only after the prospective student-athlete has completed high school eligibility in the sport and written permission has been obtained from the high school's director of athletics or, for a junior college student, after the conclusion of the sport season.

"(3) A medical examination of a prospective student-athlete conducted by an institution's regular team physician or other designated physician shall be permitted as a part of the tryout.

"(4) The tryout may include tests to evaluate the prospective student-athlete's strength, speed, agility and sports skills. Except in the sports of football, ice hockey, lacrosse, soccer and wrestling, the tryout may include competition. In the sport of football, the prospects shall not wear helmets or pads.

"(5) The time of the tryout activities (other than the physical examination) shall be limited to the length of the institution's normal practice period in the sport but shall in no event be longer than two hours.

"(6) The institution may provide equipment and clothing on an issuance-and-retrieval basis to a prospective student-athlete during the period of the tryout."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit tryouts for prospective student-athletes at Division II member institutions under the limited circumstances set forth in the proposal.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division II (78-86). Later motion to reconsider defeated by Division II (73-83).

Financial Aid

NO. 93 FINANCIAL AID LIMITATIONS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 1, pages 140-143, by adding new paragraph (d), renumbering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(d) An institution desiring to be a member of Division I shall limit its athletics financial aid awards to tuition and fees in all sports except football, men's and women's basketball, ice hockey, and women's volleyball. Once an institution has awarded full tuition and fees, it may award additional athletics financial aid to a student-athlete only on a financial need basis utilizing a uniform national formula approved by the NCAA Council. Such additional need-based financial aid shall not count against the institution's financial aid limitations in the student-athlete's sport."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(i), pages 119-120, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(i) With respect to sports other than men's and women's basketball, women's gymnastics, ice hockey, women's tennis, and women's volleyball in Division I, and football in Division I-AA and the total maximum awards limitations in football in Division I-AA, and with respect to all sports in Division II, a member institution may administer such awards to any number of recipients on the basis of value (equivalency) so long as the total dollar amount expended does not exceed the value of **tuition and fees** 'commonly accepted educational expenses' at that institution multiplied by the number of maximum awards permitted for the particular sport in its division. In Division I-AA football and Division I ice hockey, and in all sports in Division II, the total dollar amount expended may not exceed the value of 'commonly accepted educational expenses' at that institution multiplied by the number of maximum awards in the sport. The following computational method shall be utilized in administering this procedure:

"(1) The institution shall count the actual amount of money a student-athlete is awarded or receives for **room, board, tuition and fees** (or 'commonly accepted educational expenses' in Division I-AA football and Division I ice hockey, and in all sports in Division II, with books counting as \$200 per academic year) as well as books (which may not exceed \$200 per academic year);

"(2) In all equivalency sports in Division I except for ice hockey and I-AA football, the amount of need-based financial aid beyond tuition and fees shall be exempted from the financial aid limitations calculation;

"(2) (3) The actual amount the student-athlete receives in ratio to **tuition and fees** (or 'commonly accepted educational' expenses in Division I-AA football and Division I

ice hockey, and in all sports in Division II, with books counting as \$200 per academic year) the actual total maximum amount the student-athlete could receive for each item listed herein shall represent a fraction of the maximum award utilized.

"(3) (4) The sum of all fractional and maximum awards received by student-athletes shall not exceed the total limit each year in the sport in question."

Source: University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; Stanford University; University of Washington, and two other members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To limit athletically related financial aid in Division I to tuition and fees in all sports except football, men's and women's basketball, ice hockey, and women's volleyball, with subsistence to be based on a showing of financial need, and to exclude such need-based financial aid from the financial aid limitations calculations.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988; the Council shall prepare and publish the uniform national financial need formula by September 1, 1987; the limitation to tuition and fees in the specified sports shall be effective only for those student-athletes first entering member institutions subsequent to the 1987-88 academic year; equivalencies for student-athletes enrolled prior to that date shall be calculated using the computation method in effect at the time of their initial enrollment in the certifying institution.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 94 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION I-A FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(c), page 118, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"(c) Division I-A Football—There shall be an annual limit of 30 25 on the number of initial financial aid awards that may be made to student-athletes, and there shall be an annual limit of 95 on the total number of financial aid awards that may be in effect the same year, including initial awards, except that a financial aid award for a student-athlete who graduates at midyear may be replaced by an initial financial aid award. Such an initial award shall count toward the limit of 30 25 such awards for the following academic year."

Source: University of Arizona; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; Oregon State University; University of Southern California; Stanford University, and nine other Division I-A member institutions.

Intent: To reduce from 30 to 25 the number of initial financial aid awards in Division I-A football.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Approved by Division I-A. Originally withdrawn but later considered. Motion to refer to Presidents Commission defeated by Division I-A (40-51).

NO. 95 MAXIMUM AWARDS—BASKETBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(e), page 118, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(e) Division I Men's and Women's Basketball—There shall be an annual limit of 15 13 for men and 15 13 for women on the total number of financial aid awards that may be in effect the same year."

Source: University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; Oregon State University; University of Southern California; Stanford University; Washington State University, and nine other Division I member institutions.

Intent: To reduce from 15 to 13 the number of financial aid awards in Division I men's and women's basketball.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Approved by Division I. Originally withdrawn but later considered.

NO. 96 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(d), page 118, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"(d) Division I-AA Football—There shall be an annual limit of 30 on the number of initial financial aid awards that may be made to student-athletes, and in 1988 there shall be an annual limit of 70 65 and beginning in 1989 there shall be an annual limit of 60 on the value of financial aid awards in effect the same year, including initial awards. The maximum awards may not be distributed to more than 95 student-athletes."

Source: Austin Peay State University, Eastern Illinois University, Illinois State University, Southwest Missouri State University, Western Illinois University and Western Kentucky University.

Intent: To reduce the maximum awards limitation in Division I-AA football from 70 to 65 in 1988 and to 60 in 1989 (based on equivalencies).

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Referred to Presidents Commission by Division I-AA. Later motion to reconsider defeated by Division I-AA.

NO. 97—FINANCIAL AID LIMITATION—RESEARCH GRANT

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(d)-(3), page 22, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(3) Other scholarships and grants-in-aid, except an honorary award for outstanding academic achievement or the awarding of a research grant may be received without the grant or award being included in the maximum allowable financial aid computation if it is a standing scholarship award or established research grant published in the institution's catalog, the basis of the award or grant is the candidate's academic record at the awarding institution and the award or grant is determined by competition among the students of a particular class or college of the institution."

Source: NCAA Council (Eligibility Committee).

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to receive an established institutional research grant that would be exempt from the financial aid limitations set forth in Constitution 3-1-(g)-(1).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

Amateurism

NO. 98 COMPLIMENTARY ADMISSIONS

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(3), page 13, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(3) Awarding complimentary admissions in excess of four per student-athlete per contest and awarding complimentary admissions to student-athletes in sports other than those in which the student-athlete is a participant, except as provided in Constitution 3-1-(h)-(6) and the bylaws. Complimentary admission shall be provided only by a pass list for family members, relatives and fellow students designated by the student-athlete. 'Hard tickets' shall not be issued. The student-athlete may not receive any payment from any source for the complimentary admissions and may not exchange them for any item of value. Procedures for the administration of complimentary-admission programs for each division shall be controlled by bylaws enacted by the Association."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (d), as follows:

[Division I only]

"(d) Complimentary admissions shall be provided only by a pass list for individuals designated by the student-athlete. 'Hard tickets' shall not be issued. The institution shall be responsible for this administrative procedure, and the student-athlete's eligibility shall be affected by involvement in action contrary to the provisions of Constitution 3-1-(g)-(3)."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (e), as follows:

[Division II only]

"(e) Complimentary tickets shall be distributed only to persons designated by the student-athlete and who have identified themselves and signed a receipt therefor. The institution shall be responsible for this administrative procedure, and the student-athlete's eligibility shall be affected by involvement in action contrary to the provisions of Constitution 3-1-(g)-(3)."

D. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (f), as follows:

[Division III only]

"(f) Complimentary tickets shall be distributed only to persons designated by the student-athlete. The institution shall be responsible for this administrative procedure, and the student-athlete's eligibility shall be affected by involvement in action contrary to the provisions of Constitution 3-1-(g)-(3)."

Source: NCAA Council (Divisions I, II and III Steering Committees).

Intent: To authorize each division to establish procedures for the administration of complimentary admissions and to establish such a procedure in each division, including removal of the current restrictions as to which individuals may receive the admissions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions as amended by No. 98-2. Motion to postpone from morning January 9 to that afternoon was approved.

NO. 98-1 COMPLIMENTARY ADMISSIONS

Amend Proposal No. 98-B, Bylaw 4-1-(d), page 64, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(d) Complimentary admission shall be provided only by a pass list for individuals family members, relatives and fellow students designated by the student-athlete. 'Hard tickets' shall not be issued. The institution shall be responsible for this administrative procedure, and the student-athlete's eligibility shall be affected by involvement in action contrary to the provisions of Constitution 3-1-(g)-(3)."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 98-2 COMPLIMENTARY ADMISSIONS

Amend Proposal No. 98-B, Bylaw 4-1-(d), page 64, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(d) Complimentary admissions shall be provided only by a pass list for individuals designated by the student-athlete. No

more than one of the complimentary admissions may be provided to anyone other than family members, relatives or fellow students. 'Hard tickets' shall not be issued. The institution shall be responsible for this administrative procedure, and the student-athlete's eligibility shall be affected by involvement in action contrary to the provisions of Constitution 3-1-(g)-(3)."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 99 COMPLIMENTARY ADMISSIONS—DIVISION II

Amend Proposal No. 98-C, Bylaw 4-1-(e), as follows:

[Division II only]

"(e) Complimentary tickets shall be distributed only to persons designated may be received and distributed by the student-athlete and who have identified themselves and signed a receipt therefor. The institution shall be responsible for this administrative procedure, and the student-athlete's eligibility shall be affected by involvement in action contrary to the provisions of Constitution 3-1-(g)-(3)."

Source: All eight members of the Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association.

Action: Defeated by Division II. Originally withdrawn but later considered.

NO. 100 COMPLIMENTARY ADMISSIONS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(3), page 13, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(3) Awarding complimentary admissions in excess of four per student-athlete per contest and awarding complimentary admissions to student-athletes in sports other than those in which the student-athlete is a participant, except as provided in Constitution 3-1-(h)-(6) and the bylaws. Complimentary admission shall be provided only by a pass list for family members, relatives and fellow students designated by the student-athlete. 'Hard tickets' shall not be issued. Complimentary tickets shall be distributed: (i) only to persons designated by the student-athlete who have identified themselves and signed a receipt therefor; (ii) only on the day of the event, and at the site of the event. Under no circumstances shall complimentary tickets be given directly to a student-athlete. An individual may not receive complimentary tickets from more than one student-athlete. The student-athlete may not receive any payment from any source for the complimentary admissions and may not exchange them for any item of value."

Source: All 10 members of the Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To permit the recipients of a student-athlete's complimentary tickets to receive a "hard ticket" under the conditions set forth in the proposal.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Moot due to adoption of No. 98.

NO. 101 COMPLIMENTARY ADMISSIONS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(3), page 13, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(3) Awarding complimentary admissions in excess of four per student-athlete per contest and awarding complimentary admissions to student-athletes in sports other than those in which the student-athlete is a participant, except as provided in Constitution 3-1-(h)-(6) and the bylaws. Complimentary admissions shall be provided only by a pass list for family members, relatives and fellow students individuals designated by the student-athlete. No more than one of the complimentary admissions may be provided to anyone other than family members, relatives or fellow students. 'Hard tickets' shall not be issued. The student-athlete may not receive any payment from any source for the complimentary admissions and may not exchange them for any item of value."

Source: Colorado State University; University of Michigan; University of Missouri, Columbia; University of Oklahoma; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; Vanderbilt University, and two other member institutions.

Intent: To permit the student-athlete to award one complimentary admission to one person who is not a relative, family member or fellow student.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Moot due to adoption of No. 98.

NO. 102 AMATEURISM—NAME OR PICTURE

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(e), page 12, by adding new subparagraph (4), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(4) It is permissible for a student-athlete's name or picture to be used by a member institution or an officially recognized entity thereof, subject to its control, incident to the promotion and support of the institution's programs and activities by sale of publications, team or individual pictures, posters, calendars, game balls, or other items, if no commercial company or service is associated (other than through the reproduction of the sponsoring company's regular trademark or logo on the item) with the sale; and it is permissible for member institutions to provide such items to recognized charities for use in furtherance of the latter's fund-raising activities, and to provide such items for use as prizes by recognized charities. Any other use of the student-athlete's name or picture by the institution or other entity to promote the sale or use of a commercial product is prohibited."

Source: Brigham Young University, University of Hawaii, University of New Mexico, San Diego State University, U.S. Air Force Academy, University of Utah and two other members of the Western Athletic Conference.

Intent: To authorize the described uses of a student-athlete's name and picture by member institutions and to repeal Revised Case No. 44 and the Administrative Committee interpretation thereof published in the September 8, 1986, issue of The NCAA News.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 103 PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES—OLYMPIC FESTIVAL TRYOUTS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h), pages 14-15, by adding new subparagraph (7), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(7) Actual and necessary expenses for participation in USOC Olympic Festival basketball tryouts."

Source: University of Iowa; Northern Illinois University; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; University of Texas, Austin; University of Texas, San Antonio; Western Illinois University, and four other member institutions.

Intent: To permit member institutions to pay the actual expenses of enrolled student-athletes to participate in official tryouts in the sport of basketball for the USOC-sponsored Olympic Festival.

Effective Date: September 1, 1987.

Action: Approved.

NO. 104 PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES—SERIOUS INJURY OR DEATH

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h), pages 14-15, by adding new subparagraph (7), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(7) Transportation and housing expenses for parents (or legal guardians) of a student-athlete and for the student-athlete's teammates to be present in situations in which a student-athlete suffers a life-threatening injury or illness, or in the event of a student-athlete's death, to provide these expenses in conjunction with funeral arrangements."

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit the payment of expenses for parents and teammates of a student-athlete in the prescribed situations involving the student-athlete's death or life-threatening injury or illness.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

Membership and Classification

NO. 105 MULTIDIVISION CLASSIFICATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 3, pages 135-137, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 3. Multidivision Classification and Eligibility. A member institution may be classified in a division other than the one in which it is a member only as follows:

"(a) A member of Division II or Division III may petition to be classified in Division I in any one men's sport, other than football or basketball, and in any one women's sport.

"(b) A member of Division I may petition to be classified in Division I-A, Division I-AA, or Division II or Division III in football. and a member of Division II may petition to be classified in Division III football. If the petition is granted, the institution shall be entitled to vote in the division in which it is classified in football on legislative issues directly affecting football. A member of Division II may petition to be classified in Division III in any sport in which there is a Division III national championship but no Division II national championship.

"(1) A member of Division I that is classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship, except that an institution that had its football program classified in Division III prior to September 1, 1983, shall remain eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship.

"(2) A member of Division II that is classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship until it has been so classified for a period of two years.

"(c) A member institution classified in Division II or Division III that also is classified and participates in Division I ice hockey shall be permitted to vote on legislative issues directly affecting ice hockey at the Division I level.

[Paragraphs (d) and (e) unchanged.]

"(f) To be eligible for the NCAA championship in said sport in the new division on the effective September 1, the institution shall comply with all provisions of Executive Regulation 1-5-(b) and otherwise be eligible for participation in that NCAA championship. In addition, a member of Division II or Division III that has been approved for classification in one sport in Division I shall comply with the provisions of Bylaw 5-6-(c) in that sport."

Source: All seven members of the North Coast Athletic Conference.

Intent: To eliminate multidivision classification of sports for all Division III members and to prohibit Division I and Division II institutions from being classified in football or other sports in Division III.

Effective Date: September 1, 1991.

Action: Defeated by all divisions after motion to cease all debate was approved.

NO. 106 MULTIDIVISION CLASSIFICATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 3-(b), page 135, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(b) A member of Division I may petition to be classified in Division I-A, Division I-AA, or Division II or Division III in football and a member of Division II may petition to be classified in Division III in football. If the petition is granted, the institution shall be entitled to vote in the division in which it is classified in football on legislative issues directly affecting football. A member of Division II may petition to be classified in Division III in any sport in which there is a Division III national championship but no Division II national championship.

"(1) A member of Division I that is classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship, except that an institution that had its football program classified in Division III prior to September 1, 1983, shall remain eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship.

"(2) A member of Division II that is classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship until it has been so classified for a period of two years."

Source: All nine members of the Ohio Athletic Conference.

Intent: To prohibit Division I and Division II institutions from being classified in football or other sports in Division III. [Necessary editorial changes will be made in other related provisions.]

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Defeated. Defeated by Divisions I and II; no vote declared in Division III, but approval of all divisions necessary. Motion to cease debate approved.

NO. 107 FOUR-SPORT SPONSORSHIP REQUIREMENT

Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 2-(h), page 32, by adding new subparagraph (3), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(3) The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant exceptions to the four-sport sponsorship requirement for men or women if the institution's chief executive officer provides data to demonstrate insufficient student interest in maintaining the requisite number of teams. The institution shall submit its request for a waiver to the Association's executive director, with the request to be signed by the institution's chief executive officer and received at the national office by mail or wired transmission not later than July 1; any request received after that date shall be postmarked not later than June 23. The request shall include pertinent information in support of the institution's request."

Source: Jersey City State College, College of Staten Island, Stevens

Institute of Technology, Stockton State College, Suffolk University, Williams College and 57 other members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To give the NCAA Council the authority to grant an exception to the constitutional four-sport requirement for NCAA membership when an institution can demonstrate insufficient student interest to meet that requirement.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated. First defeated 336-292; 53.5 percent but two-thirds majority required. Later motion to reconsider approved and motion to cease debate approved. Then defeated 406-224; 64.4 percent but two-thirds majority required.

NO. 108 DIVISION I CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 1-(b), page 141, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(b) An institution desiring to be a member of Division I shall sponsor a minimum of six varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two three team sports, involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females in Division I, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article. An institution desiring to be a member of Division I shall sponsor a minimum of six varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two three team sports, involving all-female teams, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article."

Source: Arizona State University; University of California, Berkeley; University of Southern California; Stanford University; University of Washington; Washington State University, and two other members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To specify that of the six sports for men and six for women required for Division I membership, three for men and three for women shall be team sports.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 109 DIVISION I-A CONFERENCE WAIVER

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 1-(g)-(5)-(i), page 142, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"(5) Exceptions to the Division I-A football criteria set forth above may be granted as follows:

"(i) An institution that fails to meet the home-attendance requirement in subparagraph (3) or (4) may obtain or retain Division I-A football classification if it holds membership in a conference member (which conducts championship competition in the sport of football) in which at least six of the conference member institutions sponsor football and more

than half of the football-playing conference member institutions meet the attendance criterion for the applicable period."

Source: Arkansas State University, Louisiana Tech University, Northern Illinois University, University of Southwestern Louisiana, University of Tulsa and Wichita State University.

Intent: To provide the same waiver opportunity to member institutions of a conference seeking Division I-A classification that now is available to members of existing Division I-A conferences.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Ruled out of order.

NO. 110 SPORTS SPONSORSHIP CRITERIA WAIVER

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 4-(b)-(7), page 150, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(7) The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to the minimum number of intercollegiate contests or the minimum number of participants in a contest in situations beyond the control of the institution (i.e., weather conditions or disasters preventing completion of scheduled competition, or verified injury or illness at the site of competition preventing the participation of the required minimum number of individuals) if the institution demonstrates that its noncompliance was of a technical and unintentional nature, rather than an intentional or substantial violation of the requirements. The Council may consider any factors, including past violations of this requirement, that it deems relevant in administering this provision."

Source: All nine members of the Ohio Valley Conference.

Intent: To extend the Council's authority to grant exceptions to the minimum number of intercollegiate contests or the minimum number of participants in a contest.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 111 SPORTS SPONSORSHIP CRITERIA SANCTION

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 1-(f)-(3), page 133, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(3) An institution that fails to meet either the minimum men's or women's sports sponsorship criterion for its division shall be placed in the 'unclassified membership' category on probation for one year for its entire program (both men's and women's sports). If it has failed to meet the sports sponsorship criteria at the end of one year, it shall be placed in the 'unclassified membership' category."

Source: Canisius College; DePaul University; Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck; Marquette University; Niagara University, and St. Bonaventure University.

Intent: To permit member institutions to receive a year of probation during which to meet the sports sponsorship criteria before being placed in the "unclassified membership" category.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 112 TRACK AND FIELD

A. Bylaws: Delete note following Bylaw 11-4-(b), page 149, as follows:
[Division II only]

"[Note: Effective August 1, 1988, a Division II member institution shall count track as a single sport, with a minimum number of five intercollegiate contests each year.]"

B. Bylaws: Delete note following Bylaw 11-4-(b)-(2), page 150, as follows:

[Division II only]

"[Note: Effective August 1, 1988, a Division II member institution shall count track as a single sport, with a minimum number of 14 participants in each contest.]"

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 4-(b)-(6), page 150, as follows:
[Division II only]

"(6) A Division I institution may receive credit for sponsoring both indoor track and outdoor track if its team participates in a total of at least 12 indoor and outdoor meets during the year, with at least four indoor meets and at least four outdoor meets included in the total of 12. Until August 1, 1988, a Division II institution may receive credit in the same manner if its team participates in a total of at least 10 indoor and outdoor meets during the year, with at least three indoor meets and at least three outdoor meets included in the total of 10. After that date, Division II institutions shall count track as a single sport. Effective September 1, 1987, a Division III institution may receive credit for sponsoring both indoor and outdoor track if its team participates in a total of at least 10 indoor and outdoor meets during the year, with at least three indoor meets and at least three outdoor meets included in the total of 10."

Source: All 14 members of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association.

Intent: To reestablish indoor and outdoor track and field as separate sports for purposes of meeting the sports sponsorship requirements in Division II.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 113 ACADEMIC HONOR AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 3-(a)-(4)-(i), pages 146-147, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(i) Academic Honor Awards, which may be offered only to (a)

a student who was in the upper 20 percent of the high school graduating class or who, if the student's high school class rank is unavailable, earned an accumulative high school grade-point average of at least 3.500 (based on a maximum of 4.000) or who achieved a minimum ACT score of 24 or a minimum SAT score of 1,050, or (b) a student who does not qualify under (a) and who has completed at least one academic year in college and has earned an accumulative grade-point average of 3.300 (on a 4.000 scale) for all academic work completed during the student's collegiate enrollment resulting in degree credits at the awarding institution. Such awards shall be part of the institution's normal arrangements for academic scholarships, awarded independently of athletics interests and in amounts consistent with the pattern of all such awards made by the institution."

Source: Division III Steering Committee.

Intent: To allow a student-athlete with at least a 3.500 high school grade-point average, an ACT score of 24 or an SAT score of 1,050 to qualify for the Academic Honor Awards, regardless of whether the student was in the upper 20 percent of the high school graduating class.

Effective Date: September 1, 1987.

Action: Approved by Division III.

Championships

NO. 114 RESOLUTION: DRUG TESTING

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the NCAA Executive Committee has adopted provisions of Executive Regulation 1-4-(f) to disqualify the team of a member institution from NCAA championship competition if one member of that team tests positive for a banned substance; and

"Whereas, although the Executive Committee has suspended those provisions temporarily (anticipating they will become effective again in January 1987), the Executive Committee has clearly indicated on two occasions its firm support for disqualifying an entire team when any team member tests positive; and

"Whereas, the NCAA Special Postseason Drug-Testing Committee has recommended deletion of Executive Regulation 1-4-(f) as it pertains to drug testing; and

"Whereas, it currently is unclear when many institutions will be able to afford or gain access to a drug-testing program for the regular season that will meet the standards of the NCAA testing procedures; and

"Whereas, the abrupt elimination of competing teams from NCAA championships would be disruptive to the degree of undermining public confidence in those events and lessening the competitive experience of the student-athletes on opponent institutions' teams; and

"Whereas, the NCAA apparently intends to require forfeiture of a bowl game if any player on the winning team who participates in the game tests positive; and

"Whereas, the 1984 resolution that initiated development of the Association's drug-testing program stated clearly that 'when fully implemented, the program would include sanctions against those students who were found to have used prohibited drugs,' with no reference to sanctions against teams; and

"Whereas, NCAA Bylaw 5-2, which sets forth the NCAA drug-testing program, speaks only of the student-athlete and is devoid of mention of teams or institutions; and

"Whereas, concern for the executive regulation's provisions was expressed during the NCAA's Current Issues Forums in the spring of 1986;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Executive Committee be directed to bring to the 1988 NCAA Convention an amendment to Bylaw 5-2 to specify that the application of sanctions of ineligibility for NCAA championships or certified postseason football game competition to any student-athlete in conjunction with a positive drug test shall not extend to the student-athlete's team or institution, that receipts earned in such competition shall not be affected, that automatic qualification of the affected team's conference shall not be denied, and that the Association shall not apply such sanctions against a team or institution in the interim."

Source: All members of the Midwestern Collegiate Conference and Missouri Valley Conference, six members of the Big Sky Conference, seven members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference, six members of the Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference, nine members of the Pacific-10 Conference and seven members of the Sun Belt Conference.

Action: Ruled out of order.

NO. 115 INDIVIDUAL-TEAM CHAMPIONSHIPS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 1, Section 3, page 179, adding new paragraph (d), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(d) In individual-team championships, member institutions from Division II and Division III may enter student-athletes in Division I meets and tournaments, provided the institution is in good standing and the individuals meet the prevailing eligibility requirements, including those in Bylaw 10-6-(f), and the following individual criteria of successful performance in the particular Division II or Division III championships:

"(1) Cross Country—first two finishers in Division II and champion in Division III.

"(2) Men's Golf—first two finishers in Division II and champion in Division III. In the event of a tie for any of

these positions, a sudden-death playoff shall be held immediately to determine which athletes may advance.

"(3) Women's Gymnastics—first two finishers in the all-around competition in Division II.

"(4) Swimming—first two finishers in each Division II event and champion in each Division III event, provided they meet the minimum performance standards established by the appropriate swimming committee.

"(5) Tennis—first two finishers in singles and first two finishers in doubles in Division II, and champion in singles and champion in doubles in Division III.

"(6) Outdoor Track—first two finishers in each Division II event and champion in each Division III event, provided they meet the minimum performance standards established by the track and field committee.

"(7) Men's Wrestling—champion in each weight classification in Division II and Division III, plus additional at-large selections from the respective tournaments as may be recommended annually by the Wrestling Committee and approved by the Executive Committee. In the event an athlete from Division II or Division III qualifies for the Division I championships but is unable to participate in that tournament, such position shall be vacated in the Division I tournament and a replacement may not be appointed."

Source: Division II Steering Committee.

Intent: To reestablish Executive Regulation 1-3-(d) and rescind the Executive Committee's deletion of this regulation (announced as becoming effective August 1, 1987).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated after motion to cease debate was approved.

NO. 116 AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 7, page 115, as follows:

[Division I only]

"Section 7. Conference Eligibility. For a conference to be eligible for automatic qualification into any National Collegiate Division I Championship, it shall meet all requirements set forth in Executive Regulation 1-6. In the sport of men's basketball, it shall be a conference member that determines a conference champion in at least six sports (at least two of which shall be team sports as set forth in Executive Regulation 1-6), and it shall conduct double round-robin, in-season conference competition before declaring its champion. A conference of 12 or more institutions may establish subdivisions of six or more institutions to conduct divisional competition in basketball; in such cases, each institution shall conduct double round-robin, in-season competition in its own subdivision and single round-robin, in-season competition against

members of the other subdivision, or double round-robin, in-season competition in its own subdivision and a conference postseason tournament involving at least two-thirds of the total conference membership."

[Paragraphs (a) and (b) unchanged.]

Source: All eight members of the Southland Conference.

Intent: To provide an option for conferences of 12 or more members engaged in subdivision competition in the sport of basketball, utilizing either the current requirements or double round-robin, in-season play against members of an institution's own subdivision and a postseason tournament involving at least two-thirds of the conference membership, for automatic qualification in the Division I Men's Basketball Championship.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 117 MEN'S AND WOMEN'S INDOOR TRACK CHAMPIONSHIPS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 6, page 110, by adding the following:
[All divisions, common vote]

"National Collegiate Division II Men's Indoor Track Championships

"National Collegiate Division II Women's Indoor Track Championships"

Source: All 14 members of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association.

Intent: To reestablish the Division II Men's and Women's Indoor Track Championships. [Note: Estimated cost to Association: \$92,581 in 1986-87.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 118 CHAMPIONSHIPS ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 6-(c), page 138, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) An active member institution that holds membership in Division II is eligible to compete in *either* the Division I *or the* Division III championships in those sports for which no championship is conducted in Division II and shall declare its intention in that regard by June 1. An institution's declaration of intent in accordance with this paragraph shall be effective for a minimum of three years.

"(1) If it is to be eligible for the Division I championship in such a sport, the institution is required to meet all institutional and individual eligibility requirements of Division I

that govern the sport in question.

"(2) If it is to be eligible for the Division III championship in such a sport, the institution is required to meet all institutional and individual eligibility requirements of Division III that govern the sport in question and shall schedule and play more than 50 percent of its contests in that sport against members of Division III."

Source: All nine members of the Ohio Athletic Conference.

Intent: To eliminate those opportunities available for members of Division II to declare eligibility for the Division III championship in a sport in which there is no Division II championship.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Defeated by all divisions.

NO. 118-1 CHAMPIONSHIPS ELIGIBILITY

Amend Proposal No. 118, Bylaw 10-6-(c), page 76, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Effective date: August 1, 1987 August 1, 1991."

Source: Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania.

Action: Defeated by all divisions.

NO. 119 CHAMPIONSHIPS ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 6-(c), page 138, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) An active member institution that holds membership in Division II is eligible to compete in either the Division I or the Division III championships in those sports for which no championship is conducted in Division II according to the following criteria and such an institution shall declare its intention in that regard by June 1. An institution's declaration of intent in accordance with this paragraph shall be effective for a minimum of three years.

"(1) If it is to be eligible for the Division I championship in such a sport, the institution is required to meet all institutional and individual eligibility requirements of Division I that govern the sport in question.

"(2) If it is to be eligible for the Division III championship in such a sport, the institution is required to meet all institutional and individual eligibility requirements of Division III that govern the sport in question and shall schedule and play more than 50 percent of its contests in that sport against members of Division III.

"(3) No institution classified in Division II in a sport is eligible for the Division III championship in that sport if sufficient sponsorship exists for a separate Division II championship in that sport."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To preclude Division II member institutions from competing in Division III championships in those sports for which sufficient sponsorship exists for a Division II championship.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 120 CHAMPIONSHIPS ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 6-(c), page 138, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) An active member institution that holds membership in Division II is eligible to compete in either the Division I, or the Division III or National Collegiate Championships in those sports for which no separate championship is conducted in Division II and shall declare its intention in that regard by June 1. An institution's declaration of intent in accordance with this paragraph shall be effective for a minimum of three years.

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) If it is to be eligible for the National Collegiate Championship in such a sport, the institution is required to meet only the institutional and individual eligibility requirements of its division that govern the sport in question, except that in those sports in which two-thirds or more of the institutions sponsoring the sport are members of the same division, an institution that desires to participate in the championship is required to meet the institutional and individual eligibility requirements of that division in that sport and those of its division or the more stringent rule if both divisions have a rule concerning the same issue.

"(2) (3) If it is to be eligible for the Division III championship in such a sport, the institution is required to meet all institutional and individual eligibility requirements of Division III that govern the sport in question and shall schedule and play more than 50 percent of its contests in that sport against members of Division III."

Source: Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania, California University of Pennsylvania, East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania, Kutztown University of Pennsylvania, Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania, West Chester University of Pennsylvania and four other member institutions.

Intent: To permit a Division II member institution to declare eligibility for the National Collegiate Championship, the Division I championship or the Division III championship when no Division II championship exists.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Defeated. Defeated by Divisions I and III; no vote declared in Division II but approval of all divisions necessary.

NO. 121 CHAMPIONSHIPS ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 3-(b)-(1) and (2), page 136, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) A member of Division I that is classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship, **other than as specified in the following paragraph**, and except that an institution that had its football program classified in Division III prior to September 1, 1983, shall remain eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship.

"(2) A member of Division II that is classified in Division III in football, **or a previously nonfootball-playing institution that institutes a new football program in Division III**, shall not be eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship until it has been so classified for a period of two years."

Source: Hampden-Sydney College, Maryville College (Tennessee), Randolph-Macon College, Samford University, University of the South, and Washington and Lee University.

Intent: To permit a Division I or Division II institution that institutes a new football program and classifies it in Division III to be eligible for the Division III Football Championship after it has been so classified for a period of two years.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by all divisions after motion to cease debate was approved.

Playing and Practice Seasons

NO. 122 LIMITATIONS ON PLAYING SEASONS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(a), page 80, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) A member institution shall limit its **playing and practice seasons and contests** (games or scrimmages) with outside competition in the sports of basketball, football, ice hockey and soccer **all sports** to the periods of time specified in this section."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(b), page 81, by adding new subparagraph (5), renumbering and revising subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(5) **All other sports in Division I—Traditional fall sports: September 1 or the first day of classes of the regular fall term of the institution, whichever occurs first. Traditional winter sports: October 15. Traditional spring sports: February 1.**

"(i) The 'traditional fall season' is the period from September 1 through the second Saturday in December. The 'traditional spring season' is the period from February 1 through the last day of classes of the regular academic year at the institution, or the conclusion of the NCAA championship in that sport, whichever occurs last.

"(ii) For purposes of Bylaw 3-2-(b)-(5), 'traditional' fall sports are cross country, field hockey, women's volleyball and water polo; 'traditional' winter sports are fencing, gymnastics, indoor track, rifle, skiing, swimming and wrestling; 'traditional' spring sports are baseball, golf, lacrosse, outdoor track, men's volleyball, softball and tennis.

"(5) (6) All other sports in Divisions I and II—September 1 or the first day of classes of the regular fall term at the institution, whichever comes first, except that if September 1 falls on a Sunday or Monday, the first contest may be played on the Saturday or Sunday immediately preceding September 1.

"O.I. 307. The 'traditional fall season' is the period from September 1 (except that if September 1 falls on a Sunday or Monday, the first contest may be played on the Saturday or Sunday immediately preceding September 1) through the second Saturday in December. The 'traditional spring season' is the period from January 2 through the last day of classes of the regular academic year at the institution or the conclusion of the NCAA championship in the sport, whichever occurs last."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2, page 81, by amending paragraph (c), deleting paragraphs (d) and (e), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) The last **practice or contest** (game or scrimmage) in the sport of basketball **all sports** shall not be played **occur after the conclusion of the National Collegiate Division I Men's Basketball Championship game NCAA championship in that sport.**

"(d) The last contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in the sport of ice hockey shall not be played after the National Collegiate Division I Men's Ice Hockey Championship game.

"(e) The last contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in the sport of soccer shall not be played after the final day of classes of the regular academic year at the member institution."

D. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2, page 81, by deleting paragraph (f), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(f) Unless otherwise stated in this section, the last contest (game or scrimmage) or date of competition in a sport in Divisions I and II shall not take place after the last day of classes for the regular academic year at the institution, the conclusion of the NCAA championship in that sport or the conclusion of the national governing body national championship in that sport, whichever occurs last."

E. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(a)-(1), page 83, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(1) Division I—Maximum number of contests:

Baseball 80 **60** *(with not more than 60 during the traditional spring season)*

Soccer 22 *(during the traditional fall season)*

"(2) Division I—Maximum number of dates of competition:

Golf 30 **25**

Soccer 6 *(subsequent to the traditional fall season)*

Tennis 35 **30**

Volleyball 35 *(during the traditional season)*

Volleyball 12 *(subsequent to the traditional fall season for women and prior to the traditional spring season for men)"*

Source: Clemson University; Georgia Institute of Technology; North Carolina State University; University of Maryland, College Park; University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; University of Virginia, and one other member of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Intent: To apply seasonal playing and practice limitations to all sports, to define traditional sports seasons and designate the sports to be played in those seasons, and to adjust contest limitation numbers accordingly.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 123 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(j), page 86, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(j) *Each academic year* **Not more than once in every four years** in the sport of basketball, a member institution shall exempt from counting toward the maximum number of contests not more than one contest **(or four contests if scheduled on a single regular-season trip to Alaska, Hawaii or Puerto Rico)** or tournament (not to exceed four contests) in not more than one of the situations set forth in Bylaws 3-2-(h), 3-3-(h) and (i), *excluding the contest against a foreign team in the United States, and shall not participate in a foreign tour in basketball in any academic year (or the summer immediately thereafter) in which it utilizes any such exemption* **and 3-6.** This limitation shall not apply to a regular-season conference contest between two members of the same NCAA member conference."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Council Subcommittee to Review Playing Seasons).

Intent: To permit member institutions to take advantage of exemptions permitted by Bylaws 3-2-(h), 3-3-(h) and (i), and 3-6 only once during any four-year period without counting those contests within the maximum number of permissible contests in the sport of basketball, and to increase the number of regular-season contests

that may be exempted on a single trip to Alaska, Hawaii or Puerto Rico from one to four.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987. [Note: Those 1987-88 contests scheduled through written contracts in effect prior to publication of the 1987 Convention Official Notice would be exempted from this amendment.]

Action: Remanded by all divisions to Special Council Subcommittee to Review Playing Seasons.

NO. 124 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(h), pages 85-86, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(h) Any game or games played in Hawaii, either against or under the sponsorship of **a an active member institution** located in Hawaii; in Alaska, either against or under the sponsorship of **a an active member institution** located in Alaska, or in Puerto Rico, either against or under the sponsorship of **a an active member institution** located in Puerto Rico, shall not be considered a 'contest' or 'contests' by a member institution located outside the area in question in computing the maximum number of contests set forth in this section except as required per Bylaw 3-3-(j). A member institution located in Hawaii or Alaska shall be permitted an additional contest in the sport of football."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Council Subcommittee to Review Playing Seasons).

Intent: To permit member institutions to exempt competition in Alaska, Hawaii or Puerto Rico from counting within the maximum number of permissible contests or dates of competition in a particular sport only if such competition is conducted either against or under the sponsorship of an active member institution located in Alaska, Hawaii or Puerto Rico.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987. [Note: Those 1987-88 contests scheduled through written contracts in effect prior to publication of the 1987 Convention Official Notice would be exempted from this amendment.]

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 125 LIMITATIONS ON FOOTBALL CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(c), page 84, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) The maximum number of contests in football shall exclude the spring scrimmage, the National Football Foundation benefit game, **a conference championship game between division champions of a member conference of 12 or more institutions that is divided into two divisions (of six or more institutions each), each of which conducts round-robin, regular-season competition among the members of that**

division, and the postseason game or games permitted in Bylaw 3-2-(b)-(2)."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To exempt from the maximum number of contests in football a conference championship football game conducted under the prescribed circumstances.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 126 FOREIGN BASKETBALL TOURS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 6-(b)-(3), page 88, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(3) A team shall be limited to a maximum of three football games, 20 10 basketball games, or five contests or dates of competition in any other sport during and as part of the tour;"

Source: Indiana University, Bloomington; University of Iowa; University of Michigan; Michigan State University; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; Northwestern University, and two other members of the Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To reduce from 20 to 10 the permissible number of basketball contests during a foreign tour.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 127 POSTSEASON PRACTICE—WOMEN'S BASKETBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(b), page 87, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(b) Postseason practice in basketball shall be prohibited. For purposes of this legislation, employment as camp counselors by members of an institution's women's basketball team or one-on-one practice sessions involving a student-athlete and a coaching staff member during the regular academic year shall not be considered postseason practice."

Source: University of Arkansas, Little Rock; University of California, Berkeley; California State University, Northridge; Iona College; Lehigh University; University of Maryland, Baltimore County, and four other member institutions.

Intent: To allow women's basketball coaches to work with their student-athletes on a one-on-one basis prior to the commencement of team practice and following the end of the season.

Effective Date: September 1, 1987.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 128 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(a)-(1), page 83, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(1) Division I—Maximum number of contests:

Baseball	80 (with not more than 60 during the traditional spring season) 60 (to be played during the traditional spring season)
Softball	60 (to be played during the traditional spring season)"

Source: University of Iowa; University of Michigan; Michigan State University; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; Northwestern University; Ohio State University, and one other member of the Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To reduce from 80 to 60 the permissible number of baseball games in Division I and to provide that the permissible baseball and softball games in Division I must be played during the traditional spring season only.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Defeated by Division I. Originally withdrawn but later considered. Motion to refer to Presidents Commission defeated by Division I (124-174).

NO. 129 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(c), page 84, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"(c) The maximum number of contests in football shall exclude the spring scrimmage, the National Football Foundation benefit game and postseason game or games permitted in Bylaw 3-2-(b)-(2). Division I-A members also may participate in Japan in the Mirage Bowl game without counting such competition against the maximum number of contests, it being understood that the same institution may not participate in such competition more than once in any four-year period."

Source: Boston College, University of Georgia, University of Notre Dame, University of Oklahoma, Southern Methodist University and U.S. Air Force Academy.

Intent: To exclude from the maximum number of contests in football a Division I-A member's participation in the Mirage Bowl.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I after not being moved in its regular sequence.

NO. 130 PRESEASON PRACTICE—MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(d), pages 78-79, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(d) On the day before the opening of permissible practice as specified in Bylaw 3-1-(a), it shall be permissible to issue equipment, *have medical examinations* and take squad pictures; and, in the event this day falls on Sunday, it shall be permissible to utilize the day preceding that Sunday for this purpose. As an exception in the sports of basketball and ice hockey only, it shall be permissible to designate a single date for the taking of squad pictures following the beginning of classes in the fall term and prior to the opening of permissible practice as specified in Bylaw 3-1-(a) ; *further, it shall be permissible to have medical examinations at any time following the beginning of classes in the fall term.* It shall be permissible to administer medical examinations at any time to enrolled student-athletes or to prospective student-athletes who have signed the National Letter of Intent with the involved institution, provided the prospects visit the institution at their own expense for this purpose."

Source: University of Alabama, Baylor University, University of Florida, University of Miami (Florida), University of Mississippi, Pennsylvania State University and three other member institutions.

Intent: To permit an institution in Division I to administer medical examinations to enrolled student-athletes at any time and to administer such examinations to prospective student-athletes under the circumstances prescribed in the proposal.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 132 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3, page 85, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(e) Unless otherwise stated in this section, the maximum number of contests or dates of competition in a sport shall exclude competition in one conference championship tournament (or the tournament used to determine the conference's automatic entry in an NCAA tournament), the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) championships and the NCAA championships. In the sports of outdoor and indoor track and field, the limitations shall exclude competition in one conference championships meet, the NAIA championships and the NCAA championships in each sport.

"(f) The maximum number of contests or dates of competition in a sport, other than football or basketball, shall

exclude one contest each year with an alumni team of the institution.

"(g) The maximum number of contests or dates of competition in a sport, other than football or basketball, shall exclude one contest each year with a foreign opponent in the United States."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To exempt contests or dates of competition in Division III under the same conditions currently prescribed in these regulations for Division I and Division II.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division III.

NO. 133 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(b), page 84, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(b) Division III—A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule in the sports of football and basketball in any one year to the number of contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition set forth in this paragraph. During the traditional fall season, a member institution shall limit its total playing schedule in the sport of soccer to the number of contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition set forth in this paragraph.

[Subparagraphs (1) and (3) unchanged.]

"(2) Football—11 10."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To reduce from 11 to 10 the permissible number of contests (games or scrimmages) per season in Division III football.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Remanded to the Division III Steering Committee.

NO. 134 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(b), page 84, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(b) Division III—A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule in the sports of football and basketball in any one year to the number of contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition set forth in this paragraph. During the traditional fall season, a member institution shall limit its total playing schedule in the sport of soccer to the number of contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition set forth in this paragraph. During the traditional spring season, a member institution shall limit its total playing schedule in the sports of baseball and softball to the number of contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition set forth in this paragraph.

[Subparagraphs (1), (2) and (3) unchanged.]

"(4) Baseball—40.

"(5) Softball—40."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To limit to 40 in each sport the permissible number of regularly scheduled contests per season in baseball and softball in Division III.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Approved by Division III.

NO. 134-1 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

Amend Proposal No. 134, Bylaw 3-3-(b), pages 85-86, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(b) Division III—A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule in the sports of football and basketball in any one year to the number of contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition set forth in this paragraph. During the traditional fall season, a member institution shall limit its total playing schedule in the sport of soccer to the number of contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition set forth in this paragraph. During the traditional spring season, a member institution shall limit its total playing schedule in the sports of baseball and softball to the number of contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition set forth in this paragraph."

[Subparagraphs (1), (2) and (3) unchanged.]

"(4) Baseball—40 50.

"(5) Softball—40."

Source: Methodist College and North Carolina Wesleyan College.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 134-2 LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF CONTESTS

Amend Proposal No. 134, Bylaw 3-3-(b), pages 85-86, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(b) Division III—A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule in the sports of football and basketball in any one year to the number of contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition set forth in this paragraph. During the traditional fall season, a member institution shall limit its total playing schedule in the sport of soccer to the number of contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition set forth in this paragraph. During the traditional spring season, a member institution shall limit its total playing schedule in the sports of baseball and softball to the number of contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition set forth in this paragraph."

[Subparagraphs (1), (2) and (3) unchanged.]

"(4) Baseball—40 45.

"(5) Softball—40."

Source: All 10 members of the New Jersey Athletic Conference.

Action: Withdrawn.

GENERAL

NO. 135 FOOTBALL COACHING STAFF

Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(a), page 122, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"(a) Division I Football—One head coach and *nine* **eight** assistant coaches in Division I-A institutions; one head coach and seven assistant coaches in Division I-AA institutions. **[Note: A Division I-A institution is permitted to meet this limitation through normal attrition when employment commitments prevent immediate compliance; however, effective August 1, 1987, no more than eight assistant coaches shall be permitted to recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus.]**"

Source: University of Arizona; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Oregon; University of Southern California; Washington State University, and two other members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To reduce by one the number of permissible full-time coaches in Division I-A football.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987, except as specified in the legislation.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 136 BASKETBALL COACHING STAFF

Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(b), page 122, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(b) Division I Basketball—One head coach, two assistant coaches, *one part-time assistant coach*."

Source: University of California, Los Angeles; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; University of Southern California; Stanford University; Washington State University, and two other members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To eliminate the part-time assistant coach in Division I basketball.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987, except that a Division I institution shall be permitted to meet the limitation through normal attrition when employment commitments prevent immediate compliance.

Action: Approved by Division I. Originally withdrawn but then

considered. Motion to refer to Presidents Commission defeated by Division I. Later motion to reconsider defeated by Division I after motion to cease debate was approved.

NO. 137 BASKETBALL COACHING STAFF

Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(e), page 123, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(e) In the sport of football, Only only those coaches who are counted by the institution within the numerical limitations on full-time coaches as specified in Bylaws 7-1-(a) and (b) above may recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus. In the sport of basketball, the institution shall designate annually three coaches, who shall be the only coaches who are permitted to recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus, from among the four full- and part-time coaches specified in Bylaw 7-1-(b), and such designation shall remain effective for the full academic year."

Source: University of Alabama, Birmingham; Fordham University; Georgetown University; University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; University of Portland, and Vanderbilt University.

Intent: To permit a Division I institution to designate any three coaches in the sport of basketball who shall be permitted to recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 138 BASKETBALL COACHING STAFF

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(b), page 122, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(b) Division I Basketball—One head coach, two assistant coaches, one part-time assistant coach, and two other coaches who may be volunteer assistants and/or graduate assistants."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(c)-(1), page 122, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(1) A member institution in the sport of football may permit an one uncompensated volunteer to participate in such coaching, and in the sport of basketball permit no more than two uncompensated volunteers to participate in such coaching, provided the limitation set forth in Bylaw 7-1-(b) is not exceeded no more than one such person is involved in a sport; the person(s) receives no compensation or remuneration of any sort, except those expenses directly related to his or her coaching duties (limited to training-table meals, transportation to and from and room and board at away games, and a maximum of four complimentary tickets), from the institution's department of athletics, and the person is not permitted to recruit or scout off campus."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(h), page 124, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(h) Any individual who has received a baccalaureate degree and is enrolled in the institution in at least 50 percent of the institution's minimum regular graduate program of studies may assist in coaching subject to the limitation on number of graduate assistant coaches, provided the individual's remuneration is limited to the value of commonly accepted educational expenses and the individual does not serve as a graduate assistant coach in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph at a particular member institution for a period of more than two years. The member institution is prohibited from arranging additional employment opportunities for such a graduate assistant coach. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to the two-year limitation based on bona fide academic reasons. There shall be a limit of five graduate assistant coaches in football and two (in combination with volunteer assistant coaches) in basketball."

Source: University of Arizona; Arizona State University; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Washington; Washington State University, and three other members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To limit the number of volunteer and/or graduate assistant coaches in Division I basketball to a combination of two coaching staff positions.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 139 INTERIM ACTIONS

A. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(g), page 38, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(g) The Council may transact such part of its business by correspondence as it may deem advisable. In addition, in the interim between meetings of the Council, the president, secretary-treasurer, division vice-presidents and executive director are empowered as the Administrative Committee to transact necessary items of Council business, subject to approval of the Council in its next meeting. In that process, the Administrative Committee may authorize the executive director to act for it in approving routine waiver and exception requests, unless there is a question of interpretation or application, and these actions also shall be subject to approval of the Council in its next meeting."

B. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 2-(d), page 39, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(d) The Executive Committee may transact such part of its business by correspondence as it may deem advisable. In addition,

in the interim between meetings of the committee, the president, secretary-treasurer, division vice-presidents and executive director are empowered as the Administrative Committee to transact necessary items of Executive Committee business, subject to approval of the committee in its next meeting. **In that process, the Administrative Committee may authorize the executive director to act for it in approving routine waiver and exception requests and sports committee recommendations, unless there is a question of interpretation or application, and these actions also shall be subject to approval of the Executive Committee in its next meeting."**

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Committee).

Intent: To permit the Administrative Committee to authorize the executive director to act on certain routine requests and recommendations when they are noncontroversial and there is no question of interpretation or application.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 140 INFRACTIONS APPEALS

Enforcement Procedures: Amend Section 5-(b), page 220, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(b) The member then shall have the right to give written notice of appeal of the committee's findings [subject to the conditions of paragraph (c)], the penalty, or both, **to the Council a subcommittee of the Council, such subcommittee to be composed of Council members from the same division as the institution making the appeal.** To be considered by the subcommittee of the Council, the notice of appeal shall be received by the NCAA executive director not later than 15 calendar days from the date the member institution received the committee's report. The member's notice of appeal shall contain a statement of the date the committee's report was received by the chief executive officer and a statement indicating whether the institution desires to submit its appeal in writing only or whether the institution will be represented before the **subcommittee of the Council** at the time the appeal is considered."

Source: University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Pennsylvania State University; Texas Christian University; Texas Tech University; Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and West Virginia University.

Intent: To establish subcommittees of the Council to serve as hearing boards for infractions appeals and to require that the individuals on each subcommittee represent institutions from the same division as the institution requesting the appeal.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 141 INFRACTIONS APPEALS

Enforcement Procedure: Amend Section 6-(b)-(1), page 221, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) If the institution elects to be represented in person before the Council, the institution shall be permitted a *period of 15 minutes reasonable time* to make its oral presentation to supplement the institution's written appeal. The chair or another member of the committee then shall be permitted a *15-minute period reasonable time* to present orally the committee's report. *The NCAA Council (or Administrative Committee) may grant extensions of time in extenuating circumstances for oral presentations by the institutional and committee representatives.* **The period of time for the presentation by the institution and the committee shall be left to the discretion of the chair of the appeal board."**

Source: University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Pennsylvania State University; Texas Christian University; Texas Tech University; Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and West Virginia University.

Intent: To allow an institution a reasonable time for an oral presentation in connection with its infractions appeal to the Council, rather than the current 15-minute limitation, with the length of time to be determined by the chair of the Council's appeal board.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 142 INTERPRETATIONS

Constitution: Amend Article 6, Section 2, pages 48-49, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 2. Interpretations. The Council, in the interim between Conventions, and the Administrative Committee, in the interim between meetings of the Council, are empowered to make interpretations of the constitution and bylaws that shall be binding after their publication and circulation to the membership, or after notification to a member institution when the interpretation is limited to that institution and not of general significance or application to the membership at large.

"(a) Any member of the Association may request that any such interpretation be passed upon by the next annual Convention by making a request in writing to the secretary prior to 1 p.m. on the day preceding the business sessions of the Convention.

[Current paragraphs (a) through (e), renumbered as subparagraphs (1) through (5), unchanged.]

"(b) **Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, no action based on the violation of an interpretation of general significance shall be taken, nor shall any penalty be imposed, in any of the following cases:**

"(1) The language of the interpretation directly

contradicts or conflicts with the language of a provision of the constitution or bylaws or of a case interpretation published in the most recent NCAA Manual, unless two or more such statements in the Manual contain language that directly contradict one another.

"(2) The alleged violation occurred after the promulgation and circulation of a new NCAA Manual that did not include the interpretation as new legislation in the constitution or bylaws, or did not include it in a case interpretation published in such new Manual with proper references made to such case in the appropriate section or sections of the constitution or bylaws to which the interpretation relates.

"(3) Within 60 days of its publication, one-third of the membership, or of any division or subdivision that would have had to vote for passage if the interpretation had been proposed as legislation, objects in writing to the interpretation; provided that an interpretation that could be approved as legislation in one division or subdivision, even if rejected in another, shall not become unenforceable in any division or subdivision in which one-third of the membership does not object within the 60-day period even though one-third of the members of another division or subdivision have made such written objections."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To prohibit action being taken, or penalty imposed, if an institution is in violation of an interpretation issued under the specified conditions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated as amended by No. 142-1.

NO. 142-1 INTERPRETATIONS

Amend Proposal No. 142, Constitution 6-2, pages 90-91, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 2. Interpretations. The Council, in the interim between Conventions, and the Administrative Committee, in the interim between meetings of the Council, are empowered to make interpretations of the constitution and bylaws that shall be binding after their publication and circulation to the membership, or after notification to a member institution when the interpretation is limited to that institution and not of general significance or application to the membership at large.

"(a) Any member of the Association may request that any such interpretation be passed upon by the next annual Convention by making a request in writing to the secretary prior to 1 p.m. on the day preceding the business sessions of the Convention.

[Current paragraphs (a) through (e), renumbered as subparagraphs (1) through (5), unchanged.]

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, no action based on the violation of an interpretation of general significance shall be taken, nor shall any penalty be imposed, in any of the following cases:

"(1) The language of the interpretation directly contradicts or conflicts with the language of a provision of the constitution or bylaws or of a case interpretation published in the most recent NCAA Manual, unless two or more such statements in the Manual contain language that directly contradict one another. The Council shall be the only body to determine if a contradiction exists and its decision shall be final and binding.

"(2) Subsequent to the circulation and publication of an interpretation, but prior to the alleged violation thereof, there has been *The alleged violation occurred after the promulgation and circulation of a new NCAA Manual that did not include the interpretation as new legislation in the constitution or bylaws, or did not include it in a case interpretation published in such new Manual with proper reference made to such case in the appropriate section or sections of the constitution or bylaws to which the interpretation relates.*

"(3) Within 60 days of its publication, one-third of the membership, or of any division or subdivision that would have had to vote for passage if the interpretation had been proposed as legislation, objects in writing to the interpretation; provided that an interpretation that could be approved as legislation in one division or subdivision, even if rejected in another, shall not become unenforceable in any division or subdivision in which one-third of the membership does not object within the 60-day period even though one-third of the members of another division or subdivision have made such written objections."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Approved.

NO. 143 RESOLUTION: INTERPRETATIVE PROCESS

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the NCAA interpretative process must of necessity be employed to 'fill in the gaps' created by legislation passed at the Convention; and

"Whereas, the 'filling in the gaps' process requires the interpreters to review the legislative history of the rule, as well as the intentions of the sponsors and membership at the time a legislative proposal was adopted; and

"Whereas, the 'filling in the gaps' process often requires the interpreters to face fact situations not anticipated by the sponsors or

membership at the time of passage; and

"Whereas, the 'filling in the gaps' process often requires the interpreters to evaluate the practicality of administering the interpretation on a national basis; and

"Whereas, the 'filling in the gaps' process often requires the interpreters to interpret the legislation under review in such a way as to 'close the loophole' in order to protect the principle underlying the legislation; and

"Whereas, the NCAA membership has an interest in insuring that equitable principles, fairness and common-sense principles be considered when evaluating a particular rule and its application to a fact situation during the 'filling in the gaps' process;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA membership delegates to the NCAA Council and other properly appointed interpretative committees the authority to consider equitable as well as administrative and legal factors in attempting to interpret and apply NCAA legislation to various fact situations.

"Be It Further Resolved, that the NCAA membership specifically delegates to the NCAA Council and properly appointed interpretative committees the authority to interpret NCAA legislation in such a way as to 'plug the loophole' that threatens to undercut the primary purpose of the legislation under review and 'to create reasonable exception' through the interpretation process where practicality, equity and fairness require such exception."

Source: All nine members of the Ohio Valley Conference.

Action: Ruled out of order.

NO. 143-1 RESOLUTION: INTERPRETATIVE PROCESS

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the NCAA membership has an interest in ensuring that equitable and common-sense principles be considered when interpreting and administering NCAA constitutional and bylaw provisions; and

"Whereas, many NCAA constitutional and bylaw provisions do not expressly contain enabling language that would permit the Council to create exceptions based on equitable and common-sense considerations;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Council is urged to prepare enabling legislation for presentation at the 1988 NCAA Convention that would authorize the Council to permit exceptions based on equitable and common-sense considerations when interpreting and administering any bylaw or constitutional provision between Conventions."

Source: All nine members of the Ohio Valley Conference.

Action: Approved.

NO. 144 POSTSEASON FOOTBALL CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 2-(g), page 72, by deleting the present language and substituting the following:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(g) Each competing institution may claim tickets for up to one-sixth of the total seats in the stadium, unless an agreement is made with the sponsoring organization for a greater number of tickets. The institution shall present its ticket request within 48 hours after it is selected to participate in the game and, once claimed, tickets for those seats become the responsibility of that institution, except that a maximum of 1,000 tickets may be returned to the sponsoring organization at least 10 days prior to the game."

Source: NCAA Council (Postseason Football Committee).

Intent: To require member institutions participating in postseason bowl games to be accountable for their allotment of game tickets as prescribed in the proposal.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

Eligibility

NO. 145 SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d), page 93, and delete subparagraph (2) in its entirety, renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(d) The student-athlete shall not have engaged previously in more than four five seasons of intercollegiate competition.

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) A student-athlete may be granted an additional year of competition by the conference or the institution for reasons of 'hardship,' which is defined as that incapacity resulting from injury or illness under the following conditions:

"(i) It occurs in one of the four seasons of intercollegiate competition at any four-year collegiate institution for members of Division I, or at any two-year or four-year collegiate institution for members of Division II or III.

"(ii) It occurs when the student-athlete has not participated in more than 20 percent of the institution's completed events in his or her sport or has not participated in more than two of the institution's completed events in that sport, whichever number is greater, provided the injury or illness occurred in the first half of the season and resulted in incapacity to compete for the remainder of the season. Any contest (including a scrimmage) with outside competition is countable under the limitation. [Note: In applying the 20 percent limitation, any computation that results in a fractional portion of an event shall be rounded to the next whole number; e.g., 20 percent of a 27-game basketball schedule (5.4 games) shall be considered as six games.]

"(iii) This provision shall be administered by the conference members of the Association or, in the case of an independent member institution, by the NCAA Eligibility Committee."

Source: All eight members of the Big Sky Conference.

Intent: To allow student-athletes five, rather than four, years of eligibility within the five-year period stipulated by the provisions of Bylaw 4-1 (five-year rule).

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Defeated by all divisions.

NO. 146 SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d)-(2)-(ii), page 93, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(ii) It occurs when the student-athlete has not participated in more than 20 percent of the institution's completed events in his or her sport or has not participated in more than two of the institution's completed events in that sport, whichever number is greatest, provided the injury or illness occurred in the first half of the traditional playing season in that sport and resulted in incapacity to compete for the remainder of the traditional playing season. Any Only contests (including a scrimmages) with outside competition is during the traditional playing season or, if so designated, during the official NCAA championship playing season in that sport (e.g., spring baseball, fall soccer) shall be countable under this limitation. [Note: In applying the 20 percent limitation, any computation that results in a fractional portion of an event shall be rounded to the next whole number; e.g., 20 percent of a 27-game basketball schedule (5.4 games) shall be considered as six games.]"

Source: American International College, Bucknell University, Harvard University, Manhattan College, Union College, West Chester University and 90 other members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To specify that a student shall qualify for an additional year of competition in a sport under the terms of the "hardship" exception only on the basis of games and scrimmages completed during the traditional or NCAA championship playing season in that sport (e.g., spring baseball, fall soccer).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II (92-47) and by Division III; defeated by Division I.

NO. 147 SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d)-(3) and O.I. 500, pages 93-94, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(3) Any participation by a student as an individual or as

a representative of any team in organized competition in a sport during each 12-month period after the student's 20th birthday and prior to matriculation at a member institution shall count as one year of varsity competition in that sport, provided, however, that in no event shall the student be charged with more than one year of competition in that sport in any 12-month period after the student's 20th birthday. Participation in organized competition during time spent in the U.S. armed services shall be excepted.

"O.I. 500. Athletics competition shall be considered 'organized' if any of the following conditions exist: Competition is scheduled and publicized in advance, official score is kept, individual or team standings are maintained, official timer or game officials are used, admission is charged, teams are regularly formed or team rosters are predetermined, squad members are dressed in team uniforms, or a team is privately or commercially sponsored. Further, competition that is either directly or indirectly sponsored, promoted or administered by an individual, an organization or any other agency shall be considered organized."

Source: All eight members of the California Collegiate Athletic Association.

Intent: To adopt for Division II members the 20-year age rule currently applicable in Division I.

Effective Date: August 1, 1987.

Action: Defeated by Division II.

NO. 148 RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 501, following Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(11), page 101, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"O.I. 501. To satisfy an academic year of required residence, a student shall be enrolled in a minimum full-time program of studies during each term of attendance and also shall complete a minimum full-time program during each term of attendance or accumulate a number of hours that is at least equal to the sum total of the minimum load of each of the required terms during the academic year. A summer term may not be used to satisfy a term of residence unless it is considered indistinguishable from other regular terms."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To affirm that a summer term may not be used to satisfy a term of residence for eligibility purposes.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 149 TRANSFER RULE—SUBVARSITY COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(11), page 101, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

“(11) A transfer student from a four-year institution or a transfer student from a junior college **(who was an initial qualifier if the transfer is to a Division I member institution)** shall be eligible to compete only at the subvarsity level at the certifying *Division III* institution prior to meeting the transfer eligibility requirements set forth in subparagraphs (7), (8) and (10). Such subvarsity competition shall count as a season of competition in the sport involved.”

Source: Assumption College, Brown University, Bucknell University, Holy Cross College, Hofstra University, Springfield College and 37 other members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit transfer students from four-year and two-year colleges the opportunity to participate immediately in their sport at the subvarsity level at Divisions I and II member institutions under the conditions noted in the proposal, as is currently the case in Division III institutions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II (81-57); defeated by Division I after motion to cease debate was approved.

NO. 150 TRANSFER WAIVER—DISCONTINUED SPORT

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m)-(8), pages 103-104, and delete Case No. 321, page 377, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(8) In a particular sport **if when** the student *changed institutions in order to continue participation in a sport because transfers to the certifying institution and participates in the sport for the first time on the intercollegiate level after either of the following situations has occurred:*

“(i) *the* The student’s original four-year collegiate institution dropped the sport (in which the student has practiced or competed at that institution in intercollegiate competition) from its intercollegiate program, or

“(ii) **The student’s original four-year collegiate institution** never sponsored the sport on the intercollegiate level while the student was in attendance at the institution, provided the student had never attended any other collegiate institution that offered intercollegiate competition in that particular sport.”

Source: American International College, Franklin and Marshall College, Gannon University, Harvard University, Manhattan College, Union College and 95 other members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit the application of this transfer rule waiver at whatever time the student transfers to the certifying institution, provided the student then participates for the first time in the particular sport on the intercollegiate level after leaving the previous four-year collegiate institution, where the sport was discontinued or was never sponsored.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions as amended by No. 150-1.

NO. 150-1 TRANSFER WAIVER—DISCONTINUED SPORT

Amend Proposal No. 150, Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(8), pages 95-96, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“(8) In a particular sport when the student transfers **at any time** to the certifying institution and participates in the sport *for the first time* on the intercollegiate level after either of the following **situations conditions** has occurred:

“(i) The student’s original four-year collegiate institution dropped the sport (in which the student has practiced or competed at that institution in intercollegiate competition) from its intercollegiate program, or

“(ii) The student’s original four-year collegiate institution never sponsored the sport on the intercollegiate level while the student was in attendance at the institution, provided the student had never attended any other collegiate institution that offered intercollegiate competition in that particular sport.”

Source: Harvard University.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 151 TRANSFER RULE—NONRECRUITED STUDENT-ATHLETE

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m)-(10), page 104, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

“(10) If the student transfers to the certifying institution and the following conditions are met:

“(i) The student-athlete was not recruited per O.I. 100,

“(ii) No athletically related financial assistance has been received by the student-athlete and

“(iii) The student-athlete has neither practiced nor competed in intercollegiate athletics prior to transfer, except that a student-athlete *transferring to a Division III institution* may have participated in limited preseason tryouts.”

Source: Assumption College, Brown University, Canisius College, Gannon University, St. Michael’s College, West Chester University.

ty and 43 other members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit an exception to the normal transfer residence requirement for a walk-on, nonrecruited transfer student at a Division I or II member institution when the student's previous participation in intercollegiate athletics involved only limited preseason tryouts, as is currently the case in Division III institutions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I (174-86) and by Division II.

NO. 152 TRANSFER RULE—ONE-TIME EXCEPTION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m), pages 105-106, by deleting subparagraph (14), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(14) If the student transfers to the certifying institution from another four-year collegiate institution and the following conditions are met:

"(i) The student has not transferred previously from one four-year college to another four-year college;

"(ii) The student did not receive athletically related financial assistance at the previous institution, or the previous institution verifies in writing that the student's athletically related financial assistance was not renewed for the ensuing academic year for reasons that were unrelated to the student's transfer or that were beyond the control of the student;

"(iii) The student is in good academic standing and meets the satisfactory-progress requirements;

"(iv) The student's previous institution certifies in writing that it has no objection to the student being granted an exception to the transfer residence requirement, and

"(v) The student is a participant in a sport other than football, men's ice hockey or basketball.

"(vi) If the student transfers to the certifying institution from a Division III member institution and meets the above conditions, he or she may be eligible to compete but shall not receive athletically related financial aid during the first academic year in residence at the certifying institution."

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee) and all eight members of the California Collegiate Athletic Association.

Intent: To eliminate the one-time exception to the normal transfer residence requirements for a student-athlete transferring under the circumstances described in the legislation.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I (93-178) and by Division II. Motion to refer to Recruiting Committee defeated by Divisions I and II. Motion to cease debate approved.

NO. 153 RESOLUTION: CHAMPIONSHIPS

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the 1987 NCAA Convention has supported legislation to eliminate multidivision classification; and

"Whereas, the 1987 NCAA Convention has supported legislation to eliminate the option of Division II members to select Division III for championship competition when no Division II championship exists; and

"Whereas, by its vote the 1987 Convention has supported the philosophy of single-division competition for all sports at each member institution;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the 1987 NCAA Convention direct the Executive Committee to prepare legislation to make necessary adjustments in the sport sponsorship requirements to ensure the provision of championship opportunities in each membership division in all sports sponsored by the Association; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that such adjustments be made by the date of the elimination of the previously allowed championship options."

Source: Clarion University of Pennsylvania, Fayetteville State University, James Madison University, Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania, Southern Connecticut State University and Towson State University. [NOTE: This resolution will be withdrawn in the event that Proposal No. 118 is not adopted.]

Action: Withdrawn.

Appendix B

Roll-Call Voting

The following chart reflects the votes of each active member institution and each voting conference on the four proposals designated by the Presidents Commission for roll-call voting at the 81st annual Convention January 6-10, 1987, in San Diego. The votes were registered using a computerized voting procedure.

Listed at the bottom of the chart are those institutions or conferences that did not attend the special Convention or did not submit a ballot in any roll-call vote.

Voting Member	No. 44	No. 62	No. 63	No. 64
Abilene Christian University	Yes			Yes
Adelphi University	Yes			Yes
Adrian College	Yes			
Akron, University of	No	Yes	No	
Alabama A&M University	Yes			No
Alabama State University	No	No	No	
Alabama, University of, at Birmingham	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Alabama, University of, Huntsville				Yes
Alabama, University of, Tuscaloosa	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Alaska, University of, Anchorage	Yes			No
Alaska, University of, Fairbanks	No			No
Albany State College (Georgia)	Yes			No
Albany State University (New York)	Yes			
Albion College	Yes			
Alcorn State University	No	No	No	
Alfred University	Yes			
Allegheny College	Yes			
American International College	Yes			Yes
American University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Amherst College	Yes			
Angelo State University	Yes			Yes
Appalachian State University	No	Yes	No	
Arizona State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Arizona, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Arkansas State University	No	Yes	Yes	
Arkansas, University of, Fayetteville	Yes	No	Yes	
Arkansas, University of, Little Rock	Yes	Yes	No	
Armstrong State College	Abst.	Yes	Yes	
Ashland College	Yes			No
Association of Mid-Century Universities		No	No	No
Assumption College	No			Yes
Atlantic 10 Conference	Yes	No	Yes	
Atlantic Coast Conference	Yes	No	Yes	
Auburn University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Augsburg College	No			
Augusta College	Yes	Yes		
Augustana College (Illinois)	Yes			
Augustana College (South Dakota)	Yes			Yes
Aurora University	Yes			
Austin Peay State University	Yes	Yes	No	
Averett College	Yes			
Babson College	No			
Baldwin-Wallace College	Yes			
Ball State University	Yes	No	Yes	
Baptist College	No			
Barry University				Yes
Bates College	Yes			
Baylor University	Yes	No	Yes	
Bellarmine College	Yes			Yes
Bemidji State University	No			No
Benedict College	Yes			No

Voting Member	No. 44	No. 62	No. 63	No. 64
Bentley College	No			Yes
Berea College	No			
Bernard M. Baruch College	Yes			
Big East Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Big Eight Conference	Yes		Yes	
Big Sky Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Big South Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Big Ten Conference	Yes	No	Yes	
Binghamton, State University of New York	Yes			
Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	Yes			Yes
Boise State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Boston College	Yes	No	Yes	
Boston University	No	Yes	Yes	
Bowdoin College	Yes			
Bowie State College				No
Bowling Green State University	No	Yes	Yes	
Bradley University	No	Yes	Yes	
Brands University	Yes			
Bridgeport, University of	No			Yes
Bridgewater College (Virginia)	No			
Brigham Young University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Brooklyn College				
Brown University	No	No	Yes	
Bryant College	No			Yes
Bryn Mawr College	No			
Bucknell University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Buena Vista College	Yes			
Buffalo State University College	Yes			
Buffalo, State University of New York	Yes			
Butler University	Yes	Yes	No	
Cabrini College	Yes			
California, University of, Berkeley	Yes	No	Yes	
California, University of, Davis	Yes			Yes
California, University of, Irvine	Yes			
California, University of, Los Angeles	Yes	Yes	Yes	
California, University of, Riverside	Yes			Yes
California, University of, San Diego	Yes			
California, University of, Santa Barbara	Yes	Yes	No	
California, University of, Santa Cruz	Yes			
California Collegiate Athletic Association	Yes			Yes
California Institute of Technology	Yes			
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo	Yes			Yes
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona	Yes			No
California State University, Dominguez Hills	Yes			Yes
California State University, San Bernardino	Yes			
California State University, Bakersfield	Yes			No
California State University, Chico	Yes			No
California State University, Fresno	Yes	No	No	
California State University, Fullerton	Yes	Yes	No	
California State University, Hayward	Yes			Yes
California State University, Long Beach	Yes	No	No	
California State University, Los Angeles	Yes			Yes
California State University, Northridge	Yes			Yes
California State University, Sacramento	Yes			Yes
California State University, Stanislaus	Yes			
California Lutheran University	Yes			Yes
California University (Pennsylvania)	Yes			No
Calvin College	Yes	Yes	No	
Canisius College	Yes			
Capital University	Yes			
Carleton College	Yes			
Carnegie-Mellon University	Yes			
Carroll College (Wisconsin)	Yes			
Carthage College	Yes			
Case Western Reserve University	No			
Catholic University	Yes			
Centenary College	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Central College (Iowa)	Yes			
Central Connecticut State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Central Florida, University of	No	Yes	Yes	
Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association	No			No

Voting Member	No. 44	No. 52	No. 63	No. 64
Central Michigan University	Yes	No	Yes	No
Central Missouri State University	No			Yes
Chaminade University	Yes			No
Chapman College	Yes			Yes
Cheyney University of Pennsylvania	Yes			No
Chicago State University	No	Yes	Yes	
Chicago, University of	Yes			
Christopher Newport College	Yes			
Cincinnati, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Citadel, The	No	Yes	Yes	
Claremont-McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps College	Yes			
Clarion University of Pennsylvania	No			
Clarkson University	Yes			
Clemson University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Cleveland State University	No	Yes	No	
Coastal Carolina College	No	Yes	Yes	
Coe College	Yes			
Colby College	Yes			
Cotgate University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Colonial Athletic Association	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Colorado College	Yes			No
Colorado School of Mines	Yes			
Colorado State University	Yes	No	Yes	
Colorado, University of	Yes	No	Yes	
Columbia University-Barnard College	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Columbus College (Georgia)	Yes			
Concordia College (Minnesota)	Yes			
Connecticut College	Yes			
Connecticut, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Cornell University (New York)	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Cortland State University College	No			
Creighton University	Yes	No	Yes	
Dartmouth College	Yes	No	Yes	
Davidson College	No	Yes	Yes	
Dayton, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
DePaul University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
DePauw University	Yes			
Delaware State College	No	Yes	No	
Delaware Valley College	Yes			
Delaware, University of	No	No	Yes	Yes
Delta State University	No			
Denison University	Yes			Yes
Denver, University of	Yes			Yes
Detroit, University of	Yes	No	Yes	
Dickinson College	Yes			No
District of Columbia, University of	No			
Drake University	No	No	Yes	
Drew University	Abst.			
Drexel University	No	Yes	Yes	
Duke University	Yes	No	Yes	
Duquesne University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Earlham College	Yes			
East Carolina University	Yes	Yes	No	
East Coast Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania	Yes			No
East Tennessee State University	No	No	Yes	Yes
East Texas State University	Yes			
Eastern College Athletic Conference	Yes	No	Abst.	
Eastern Illinois University	No	No	No	
Eastern Kentucky University	No	Yes		
Eastern Michigan University	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Eastern Montana College	Yes			No
Eastern New Mexico University	Yes			
Eastern Washington University	No	Yes	Yes	No
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania	Yes			No
Elizabeth City State University	No			No
Elmhurst College	Yes			
Elmira College	Yes			
Emory University	Yes			
Evansville, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Fairfield University	Yes	Yes	Yes	

Voting Member	No. 44	No. 52	No. 63	No. 64
Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison	No			
Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck	No	No	Yes	
Fayetteville State University	No			No
Ferris State College	Yes			No
Ferrum College	Yes			
Fisk University	No			
Fitchburg State College	Yes			
Florida A&M University	No	No		
Florida Atlantic University	Yes			Yes
Florida International University	Yes			
Florida Southern College	Yes		Yes	
Florida State University	Yes	No	Yes	
Florida, University of	Yes	No	Yes	
Fordham University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Fort Valley State College	No			No
Framingham State College	Yes			
Franklin and Marshall College	Yes			
Franklin Pierce College	Yes			No
Frederick State University College	Yes			
Frostburg State College	Yes			
Furman University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Gallaudet College	Yes			
Gannon University	Yes			Yes
Gateway Collegiate Athletic Conference	No	Abst.	No	
Geneseo State University College	Yes			
George Mason University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
George Washington University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Georgetown University	No	Yes	No	
Georgia Southern College	Yes	Yes	No	
Georgia State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Georgia Institute of Technology	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Georgia, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Gettysburg College	Yes			
Glassboro State College	Yes			
Gonzaga University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Grambling State University	No	No	No	Yes
Grand Valley State College	No			
Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	No			Yes
Great Lakes Valley Conference	Yes			Yes
Greensboro College	Yes			
Grinnell College	Yes			
Gulf South Conference	Yes			No
Gulf Star Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Hampden-Sydney College	Yes			
Hampton University	No		No	
Hardin-Simmons University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Hartford, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Hartwick College	Yes			
Harvard University	Yes	No	Yes	
Haverford College	Yes			
Hawaii, University of	Yes	No	Yes	
Herbert H. Lehman College	Yes			
High Country Athletic Conference	No	Yes	Yes	
Hobart-Smith Colleges	Yes			
Holista University	No	Yes	Yes	
Holins College	No			
Holy Cross College	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Hope College	Yes			
Houston Baptist University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Houston, University of	Yes	No	Yes	
Howard University	No			
Humboldt State University	Yes			Yes
Hunter College	Yes			
Idaho State University	Yes	No	No	
Idaho, University of	No	Yes	Yes	
Illinois Benedictine College	Yes			
Illinois College	Yes			
Illinois State University	No	Yes	Yes	
Illinois, University of, Champaign	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Illinois, University of, Chicago	No	Yes	Yes	
Indiana State University	No	Yes	Yes	

Voting Member	No. 44	No. 52	No. 63	No. 64
Indiana University, Bloomington	Yes			
Indiana University (Pennsylvania)	Yes			
Indiana U.-Purdue U., Ft. Wayne	No			Yes
Indianapolis, University of	Yes			Yes
Iona College	Yes	Yes	No	
Iowa State University	Yes	No	Yes	
Iowa, University of	Yes	No	Yes	
Ivy Group Presidents, Council of	Yes	No	Yes	
Jackson State University	No	No	No	
Jacksonville State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Jacksonville University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
James Madison University	No	Yes	Yes	
Jersey City State College	Yes			
John Carroll University	Yes			
John Jay College of Criminal Justice	Yes			
Johns Hopkins University	Yes			
Johnson C. Smith University	No			
Junata College	Yes			
Kalamazoo College	Yes			
Kansas, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Kansas State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Kean College	Yes			
Keene State College	Yes			Yes
Kent State University	No	No	Yes	
Kentucky, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Kentucky State University	No			No
Kentucky Wesleyan College	No			Yes
Kenyon College	No			
King's College (Pennsylvania)	Yes			
Knox College	Yes			
Knoxville College				
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	Yes			No
La Salle University	No	Yes	Yes	
La Verne, University of	Yes			
Lafayette College	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Lake Superior State College	No			No
Lamar University	No	Yes	Yes	
Lawrence University	Yes			
Le Moyne College	Yes			Yes
Lehigh University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Lewis University	Yes			Yes
Liberty University	Yes			Yes
Lincoln University (Missouri)	No			No
Livingston University	Yes			No
Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania	Yes			No
Long Island University-Brooklyn Center	No	Yes	No	
Long Island University/C. W. Post Campus	Yes			No
Longwood College	Yes			Yes
Loras College	Yes			
Louisiana State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Louisiana Tech University	No	No		
Louisville, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Lowell, University of	No			No
Loyola College (Maryland)	Yes	No	Yes	
Loyola Marymount University	Abst.	Yes	Yes	
Loyola University (Illinois)	No	Yes	No	
Luther College	Yes			
Lynchburg College	Yes			
Mazelester College	Yes			
Maine Maritime Academy	Yes			
Maine, University of, Orono	No	No	Yes	
Manhattan College	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Manhattanville College	Yes			
Mankato State University	Yes			Yes
Mansfield University of Pennsylvania	Yes			No
Marist College	Yes	Yes	No	
Marquette University	No	Yes	Yes	
Marshall University	No	Yes	No	
Mary Baldwin College	No			
Mary Washington College	Yes			
Maryland, University of, Baltimore County	No	Yes	Yes	

Voting Member	No. 44	No. 52	No. 63	No. 64
Maryland, University of, College Park	Yes			
Maryland, University of, Eastern Shore	No	Yes	No	
Maryville College (Missouri)	Yes			
Marywood College	Yes			
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Yes			
Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference	Yes			
Massachusetts Maritime Academy	Yes			
Massachusetts, University of, Amherst	No	No	Yes	
Massachusetts, University of, Boston	Yes			
McNeese State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Medgar Evers College	Yes			
Memphis State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Mercer University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Mercyhurst College	Yes			No
Merrimack College	No			Yes
Messian College	Yes			
Methodist College	Yes			
Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	Yes	No	No	
Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Metropolitan State College	Yes			No
Miami, University of (Florida)	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Miami University (Ohio)	Yes	No	Yes	
Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association	Yes			
Michigan State University	Yes	No	Yes	
Michigan Technological University	Yes			Yes
Michigan, University of	Yes	No	Yes	
Mid-American Athletic Conference	Yes	No	Yes	
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference	No			
Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference	Yes			
Middle Tennessee State University	Yes	Yes	No	
Middlebury College	Yes			
Midwest Athletic Conference for Women	Yes			
Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference	Yes			
Midwestern Collegiate Conference	Yes	No	Yes	
Midwestern State University	No			No
Millersville University of Pennsylvania	Yes			Yes
Miliken University	Yes			
Millaps College	Yes			
Minnesota, University of, Duluth	Yes			No
Minnesota, University of, Twin Cities	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Mississippi College	Yes			No
Mississippi State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Mississippi Valley State University	No	Yes	No	
Mississippi, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association	No			No
Missouri Valley Conference	Abst.	Abst.	Abst.	
Missouri, University of, Columbia	Yes	No	Yes	
Missouri, University of, Rolla	No			Yes
Missouri, University of, St. Louis	Yes			Yes
Molloy College	Yes			No
Monmouth College (New Jersey)	Yes			
Montana State University	Yes	No	Yes	
Montana, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Montclair State College	Yes			
Morehead State University	Yes	Yes	No	
Morgan State University		No		
Morningside College	Yes			
Morris Brown College	Yes			No
Mount Holyoke College	Yes			
Mount Union College	Yes			
Mountain West Athletic Conference	Yes	No	Yes	
Muhlenberg College	Yes			
Murray State University	Yes	Yes	No	
Nazareth College (New York)	Yes			
Nebraska Wesleyan University	Yes			
Nebraska, University of, Lincoln	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Nebraska, University of, Omaha	Yes			Yes
Nevada, University of, Las Vegas	Yes	No	No	
Nevada, University of, Reno	No	Yes	No	
New England College				Yes
New England Collegiate Conference	No			Abst.

Voting Member	No. 44	No. 62	No. 63	No. 64
New Hampshire, University of	Yes			
New Haven, University of	No			No
New Jersey Athletic Conference	Yes			
New Jersey Institute of Technology	Yes			
New Mexico, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
New Mexico State University	No	Yes	No	
New Orleans, University of	Yes	No	Yes	
New Rochelle, College of	Yes			
New South Women's Athletic Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	
New York, City College of	Yes			
New York, Polytechnic Institute of	Yes			Yes
New York Institute of Technology	Yes			
New York Maritime College, State University of	Yes			
New York State Women's Collegiate Athletic Conference	No			
New York University	Yes			
Niagara University	Yes	No	No	
Nichols State University	Yes			
Nichols College	No			No
Norfolk State University	No			
North Adams State College	Yes			Yes
North Alabama, University of	No			
North Carolina, University of, Asheville	Yes	Yes	Yes	
North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill	Yes	Yes	Yes	
North Carolina, University of, Charlotte	Yes	No	Yes	
North Carolina, University of, Greensboro	Yes			
North Carolina, University of, Wilmington	Yes	No	Yes	
North Carolina A&T State University	No	No	No	
North Carolina Central University	Yes			No
North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Yes			Yes
North Carolina State University	Yes	No	Yes	
North Carolina Wesleyan College	Yes			
North Central College	Yes			
North Coast Athletic Conference	Yes			
North Dakota, University of	Yes			Yes
North Dakota State University	Yes			No
North Texas State University	Yes			
Northeast-Eight Conference	No			Yes
Northeast Louisiana University	No	Yes	Yes	
Northeast Missouri State University	No			Yes
Northeastern University	No	Yes	Yes	
Northern Arizona University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Northern California Athletic Conference	Yes			Yes
Northern Colorado, University of	Yes			Yes
Northern Illinois University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Northern Iowa, University of	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Northern Kentucky University	Yes			No
Northern Michigan University	Yes			
Northwest Missouri State University	No			No
Northwestern State University	No	Yes	Yes	
Northwestern University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Norwich University	Yes			Yes
Notre Dame, University of	Yes	No	Yes	
Oakland University	Yes			
Oberlin College	Yes			
Occidental College	Yes			
Ohio Athletic Conference	Yes			
Ohio Northern University	Yes			
Ohio State University	Yes	No	Yes	
Ohio University	Yes	No	Yes	
Ohio Valley Conference	Yes			
Oklahoma State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Oklahoma, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Old Dominion Athletic Conference	Yes			
Old Dominion University	Yes	Yes	No	
Olivet College	Yes			
Oneonta State University College	Yes			
Oral Roberts University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Oregon, University of	Yes	Yes	No	
Oregon State University	Yes	No	Yes	
Oswego State University College	Yes			
Pacific Coast Athletic Association	Yes	Yes	No	

Voting Member	No. 44	No. 62	No. 63	No. 64
Pacific, University of		Yes		
Pacific-10 Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Pan American University	Yes	No	Yes	
Pembroke State University	Yes			
Pennsylvania, University of	Yes		Yes	
Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference	Yes			No
Pennsylvania State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Pepperdine University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Philadelphia College of Textiles & Science				Yes
Pine Manor College	Yes			
Pittsburgh, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Pittsburgh, University of, Johnstown	Yes			Yes
Plattsburgh State University College	Yes			
Plymouth State College	Yes			
Pomona-Pitzer Colleges	Yes			
Portland State University	Yes			Yes
Portland, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Potsdam State University College	Yes			
Prairie View A&M University	No	No	No	
Princeton University	Yes	No	Yes	
Providence College	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Puget Sound, University of	Yes			Yes
Purdue University	Yes	No	Yes	
Queens College	No			Yes
Quincy College	No			Yes
Quinnipiac College	No			No
Radford University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Ramapo College	Yes			
Randolph-Macon College	Yes			Yes
Redlands, University of	Yes			
Regis College (Colorado)	Yes			No
Regis College (Massachusetts)	Yes			
Rhode Island, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Rhode Island College	Yes			
Rhodes College	Yes			
Rice University	Yes	No	Yes	
Richmond, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Rider College	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Robert Morris College	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Rochester, University of	Yes			
Rochester Institute of Technology	Yes			
Rockford College	Yes			
Rollins College	Yes			Yes
Rutgers University, New Brunswick	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Saginaw Valley State College	Yes			Yes
St. Anselm College	No			Yes
St. Augustine's College	Yes			No
St. Bonaventure University	Yes	No	Yes	
St. Catherine, College of	Yes			
St. Cloud State University	Yes			No
St. Francis College (New York)	No			
St. Francis College (Pennsylvania)	Yes	Yes	No	
St. John's University (New York)	Yes	No	No	
St. Joseph's College (Indiana)	Yes			Yes
St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania)	Yes	Yes	Yes	
St. Lawrence University	Yes			
St. Leo College	Yes			Yes
St. Louis University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
St. Mary's College (California)	Yes	Yes	Yes	
St. Mary's College (Minnesota)	Yes			
St. Michael's College	No			Yes
St. Norbert College	Yes			
St. Paul's College	No			No
St. Peter's College	Yes	Yes	Yes	
St. Thomas, College of (Minnesota)	No			
St. Thomas University (Florida)	Yes			Yes
Salem State College	Yes			
Sam Houston State University	Yes			
Samford University	Yes			
San Diego, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
San Diego State University	Yes	No	Yes	

Voting Member	No. 44	No. 62	No. 63	No. 64
San Francisco, University of	No	Yes	Yes	No
San Francisco State University	Yes			
San Jose State University	Yes	Yes	No	
Santa Clara University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Savannah State College	No			No
Scranton, University of	Yes			Yes
Seattle Pacific University	Yes			
Seton Hall University	Yes	Yes	No	No
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania	Yes			No
Siena College	Yes	Yes		
Simmons College	Yes			
Skidmore College	Yes			
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania	Yes			No
Sonoma State University	Yes			Yes
South Alabama, University of	Yes	Yes	No	
South Carolina, University of	Yes	No	Yes	
South Carolina State College	No	Yes	No	
South Dakota, University of	Yes			No
South Dakota State University	Yes			Yes
South Florida, University of	Yes	No	Yes	
South, University of The	Yes			
Southampton Campus of Long Island University	Yes			
Southeast Missouri State University	No			No
Southeastern Conference	Yes		Yes	
Southeastern Louisiana University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Southeastern Massachusetts University	Yes			
Southern California, University of	Yes	No	Yes	
Southern Conference	No	Yes	Yes	
Southern Connecticut State University	No			Yes
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale	No		No	
Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville	No			Yes
Southern Indiana, University of	Yes			Yes
Southern Methodist University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Southern Mississippi, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Southern University, Baton Rouge	No	No	No	
Southern Utah State College	Yes			Yes
Southland Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Southwest Athletic Conference	Yes	No	Yes	
Southwest Baptist University	No			No
Southwest Missouri State University	No	Yes	No	
Southwest Texas State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Southwestern Athletic Conference	No	No	No	
Southwestern Louisiana, University of	Yes	Yes	No	
Springfield College	Yes			Yes
Stanford University	Yes	No	Yes	
State University of New York Athletic Conference	Yes			
Staten Island, College of	Yes			
Stephen F. Austin State University	Yes	Yes	No	
Stetson University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Stockton State College	Yes			
Stony Brook, State University of New York	Yes			
Suffolk University	Yes			
Sun Belt Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Sunshine State Conference	Yes			Yes
Susquehanna University	Yes			
Swarthmore College	Yes			
Sweet Briar College	Yes			
Syracuse University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Tampa, University of	Yes			Yes
Temple University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Tennessee State University	Yes	No		
Tennessee Technological University	Yes	Yes	No	
Tennessee, University of, Chattanooga	No	Yes	No	
Tennessee, University of, Knoxville	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Tennessee, University of, Martin	No			No
Texas, University of, Arlington	No	Yes	Yes	
Texas, University of, Austin	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Texas, University of, El Paso	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Texas, University of, San Antonio	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Texas A&I University	Yes			Yes

Voting Member	No. 44	No. 62	No. 63	No. 64
Texas A&M University	Yes			
Texas Christian University	Yes	No	Yes	
Texas Tech University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Texas Woman's University	Yes			Yes
Threl College	Yes			
Toledo, University of	Yes	No	Yes	
Towson State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Trans America Athletic Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Trinity College (Connecticut)	Yes			
Trinity University (Texas)	Yes			
Troy State University	Yes			No
Tufts University	Yes			
Tulane University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Tulsa, University of	Yes	No	Yes	
Tuskegee University	No			No
U.S. Air Force Academy	Abst.	Yes	Yes	
U.S. Coast Guard Academy	Yes			
U.S. International University	Yes		No	
U.S. Merchant Marine Academy	Yes			
U.S. Military Academy		Abst.	No	Yes
U.S. Naval Academy		Abst.	No	Yes
Union College (New York)	Yes			
Ursinus College	Yes			
Utah, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Utah State University	Yes	Yes	No	
Utica College	Yes			
Valdosta State College	No			Yes
Valparaiso University	Yes	No	Yes	
Vanderbilt University	Yes	No	Yes	
Vassar College	Yes			
Vermont, University of	Yes	No	Yes	
Villanova University	No	Yes	Yes	
Virginia, University of	Yes		Yes	
Virginia Commonwealth University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Virginia Military Institute	No	Yes	Yes	
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Virginia State University	No			No
Virginia Union University	No			
Wabash College	Yes			
Wagner College	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Wake Forest University	Yes	No	Yes	
Warburg College	Yes			
Washington and Lee University	Yes			
Washington, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Washington College (Maryland)	Yes			
Washington State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Washington University (Missouri)	Yes			
Wayne State University (Michigan)	Yes			Yes
Weber State College	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Wellesley College	Yes			
Wentworth Institute of Technology	Yes			
Wesleyan University	Yes			
West Chester University of Pennsylvania	Yes			No
West Coast Athletic Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	
West Georgia College	No			Yes
West Texas State University	Yes			Yes
West Virginia University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Western Athletic Conference	Yes	No	Yes	
Western Carolina University	No	Yes	Yes	
Western Illinois University	No	Yes	No	
Western Kentucky University	Yes	Yes	No	
Western Maryland College	Yes			
Western Michigan University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Westfield State College	Yes			
Wheaton College (Illinois)	Yes			
Wheaton College (Massachusetts)	Yes			
Whitman College	Yes			
Whittier College	Yes			
Wichita State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Widener University	Yes			

Voting Member	No. 44	No. 52	No. 53	No. 64
Willamette University	Yes			
William and Mary, College of	No	Yes	Yes	
William Paterson College	No			
Winston-Salem State University	Yes			No
Winthrop College	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Wisconsin, University of, Eau Claire	Yes			
Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay	No	No	No	
Wisconsin, University of, La Crosse	Yes			
Wisconsin, University of, Madison	Yes	No	Yes	
Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee	Yes			Yes
Wisconsin, University of, Oshkosh	Yes			
Wisconsin, University of, Platteville	Yes			
Wisconsin, University of, Stevens Point	Yes			
Wisconsin, University of, Stout	Yes			
Wisconsin, University of, Whitewater	Yes			
Wittenberg University	Yes			
Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	No			
Worcester, College of	Yes			
Worcester Polytechnic Institute	Yes			
Worcester State College	Yes			
Wright State University	No			Yes
Wyoming, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Xavier University (Ohio)	Yes	No	Yes	
Yale University	Yes	No	Yes	
Youngstown State University	Yes	Yes	No	
Totals	549 Y 148 N 7 A	202 Y 53 N 2 A	235 Y 68 N 2 A	93 Y 70 N 1 A

Legend: Y - Yes; N - No; A - Abstentions.

Member institutions that did not vote or send a voting representative:

Albright College; Allentown College of St. Francis de Sales; Alma College; Anna Maria College; Asbury College.

Beloit College; Bethany College (West Virginia); Bethel College (Minnesota); Bethune-Cookman College; Blackburn College; Brockport State University College.

Campbell University; Castleton State College; Central State University (Ohio); Centre College; City University of New York Athletic Conference; Clark College (Georgia); Clark University (Massachusetts); Colby-Sawyer College; College Athletic Conference; College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin; Commonwealth Coast Conference; Concordia College (Illinois); Concordia College (New York); Continental Divide Conference; Coppin State College; Cornell College (Iowa); Curry College.

Davis and Elkins College; Dominican College of San Rafael; Dubuque, University of; Eastern Connecticut State University; Eastern Mennonite College; Eastern States Athletic Conference; Eckerd College; Elizabethtown College; Emerson College; Emmanuel College; Emory and Henry College; Eureka College.

Florida Institute of Technology.

Grove City College; Gustavus Adolphus College.

Hamilton College; Hamline University; Heidelberg College; Hillsdale College; Hiram College; Howard Payne University.

Illinois Wesleyan University; Immaculata College; Independent College Athletic Conference; Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Ithaca College.

Johnson State College.

Knoxville College.

Lake Forest College; Lane College; Le Moyne-Owen College; Lebanon Valley College; Lewis and Clark College; Lincoln University (Pennsylvania); Livingstone College; Lone Star Conference; Lycoming College.

MacMurray College; Maine, University of; Farmington; Marietta College; Marymount University (Virginia); Maryville College (Tennessee); Menlo College; Mercy College; Meredith College; Miles College; Mills College; Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Mississippi University for Women; Monmouth College (Illinois); Moravian College; Morehouse College; Mount St. Mary's College; Muskingum College.

New Hampshire College; New Paltz State University College; North Park College; Northwood Institute; Notre Dame, College of (California).

Ohio Wesleyan University; Old Westbury State University College; Otterbein College; Our Lady of the Elms, College of.

Pace University; Paine College; Pennsylvania State University-Behrend College; Pfeiffer College; Presidents' Athletic Conference; Principia College.

Randolph-Macon Woman's College; Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; Ripon College; Roanoke College; Roger Williams College; Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology; Rust College; Rutgers University, Camden; Rutgers University, Newark.

St. Andrews Presbyterian College; St. Benedict, College of; St. John Fisher College; St. John's University (Minnesota); St. Joseph's College (Maine); St. Mary's College (Maryland); St. Olaf College; St. Scholastica, College of; Salisbury State College; Salve Regina College; Shaw University (North Carolina); Shenandoah College; Simpson College; Smith College; Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Southern Maine, University of; Stevens Institute of Technology; Stillman College; Stonehill College.

Texas Southern University; Trenton State College; Trinity College (Illinois).

Upper Iowa University; Upsala College.

Virginia Wesleyan College.

Washington and Jefferson College; Webster University; Wells College; Wesley College; Western Connecticut State University; Western New England College; Wilkes College; William Penn College; Williams College; Winona State University; Wisconsin, University of, Parkside; Wisconsin, University of, River Falls; Wisconsin, University of, Superior.

Yeshiva University; York College (Pennsylvania).

Appendix C

81st Annual Convention

Nominating Committee

Chair—Cecil W. Ingram

I-1—Edward Leland, Dartmouth College
I-1—Kathleen M. Wear-McNally, La Salle University
I-2—Cecil W. Ingram, Florida State University
I-2—Nelson E. Townsend, Florida A&M University
I-3—Richard M. Bay, Ohio State University
I-3—John P. Mahlstedt, Iowa State University
I-4—Barbara B. Hollmann, University of Montana
I-4—Fred Jacoby, Southwest Athletic Conference
II-1—Edward P. Markey, St. Michael's College
II-2—Sandra T. Shuler, North Carolina Central University
II-3—George M. MacDonald, Grand Valley State College
II-4—Edwin W. Lawrence, University of Alaska, Fairbanks
III-1—Rocco J. Carzo, Tufts University
III-2—Patricia A. Rogers, State University of New York, Albany
III-3—Milton E. Reece, Greensboro College
III-4—Russell J. Poel, North Central College

Men's Committee on Committees

Chair—Dennis J. Keihn

District 1—Lawrence P. Boyd, Framingham State College
District 2—Gene A. Carpenter, Millersville Univ. of Pennsylvania
District 3—Kenneth A. Free, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference
District 4—James W. Lessig, Mid-American Athletic Conference
District 5—Noel W. Olson, North Central Intercol. Athletic Conf.
District 6—Michael T. Johnson, University of Houston
District 7—Ronald D. Stephenson, Big Sky Conference
District 8—Charles Whitcomb, San Jose State University
At Large—Allen F. Ackerman, Elmhurst College
At Large—Dennis L. Keihn, California State University, Los Angeles
At Large—Roy F. Kramer, Vanderbilt University
At Large—John L. Spring, Oswego State University College

Women's Committee on Committees

Chair—Eve Atkinson

District 1—Mary Lou Thimas, Bridgewater State College (Mass.)
District 2—P. LaVerne Sweat, Hampton University
District 3—Joyce Sorrell, Troy State University
District 4—Karen L. Womack, Miami University (Ohio)
District 5—Rosemary Fri, University of Northern Colorado
District 6—Martha E. Hawthorne, Rice University
District 7—Margie H. McDonald, High Country Athletic Conference
District 8—Kay Don, California State University, Long Beach
At Large—Eve Atkinson, Temple University
At Large—Sheila Brewer, Macalester College

At Large—Mary Frances Heishman, Bridgewater College (Va.)
At Large—Judith R. Holland, University of California, Los Angeles

Voting Committee

Chair—Donald G. Combs

District 1—George R. Hamilton, New England College
District 2—Norman A. Sundstrom, Allegheny College
District 3—Lloyd C. Johnson, Bethune-Cookman College
District 4—Clarence Underwood Jr., Big Ten Conference
District 5—Erv Mondt, Morningside College
District 6—Ann Uhler, Texas Woman's University
District 7—W. Harold Godwin, University of Idaho
District 8—Margaret P. Olaveson, Loyola Marymount University
At Large—Donald G. Combs, Eastern Kentucky University
At Large—Leanne Grotke, California State University, Fullerton
At Large—John Semanik, Drexel University

Memorial Resolutions Committee

Chair—Nancy M. Vedral

Bradford W. Hovious, Delta State University
Reginald L. Price, California State University, San Bernardino
Nancy M. Vedral, Northern Illinois University

Credentials Committee

Chair—Jane Goss

Charles Prophet, Mississippi Valley State University
Jane Goss, Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania
Frank Mach, College of St. Thomas

Parliamentarian

Alan J. Chapman, Rice University

1988 Convention

Opryland Hotel, Nashville, Tennessee, January 10-14

Appendix D

NCAA Convention Sites, 1949-1987

43rd	1949	San Francisco (St. Francis)
44th	1950	New York City (Commodore)
45th	1951	Dallas (Adolphus)
46th	1952	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
47th	1953	Washington (Mayflower)
48th	1954	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
49th	1955	New York City (New Yorker)
50th	1956	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
51st	1957	St. Louis (Jefferson)
52nd	1958	Philadelphia (Bellvue Stratford)
53rd	1959	Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton)
54th	1960	New York City (Astor)
55th	1961	Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton)
56th	1962	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
57th	1963	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
58th	1964	New York City (Commodore)
59th	1965	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
60th	1966	Washington (Sheraton Park)
61st	1967	Houston (Sheraton Lincoln)
62nd	1968	New York City (Biltmore)
63rd	1969	Los Angeles (Hilton)
64th	1970	Washington (Statler Hilton)
65th	1971	Houston (Astroworld)
66th	1972	Hollywood, Florida (Diplomat)
67th	1973	Chicago (Palmer House)
1st Special	1973	Chicago (Regency Hyatt House)
68th	1974	San Francisco (St. Francis)
69th	1975	Washington (Sheraton-Park)
2nd Special	1975	Chicago (Palmer House)
3rd Special	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
70th	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
71st	1977	Miami Beach (Fontainebleau)
72nd	1978	Atlanta (Peachtree Plaza)
73rd	1979	San Francisco (St. Francis)
74th	1980	New Orleans (Fairmont)
75th	1981	Miami Beach (Fontainebleau Hilton)
4th Special	1981	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront)
76th	1982	Houston (Hyatt Regency)
77th	1983	San Diego (Town and Country)
78th	1984	Dallas, Texas (Loews Anatole)
79th	1985	Nashville (Opryland)
5th Special	1985	New Orleans (Hyatt Regency)
80th	1986	New Orleans (Hilton Riverside)
81st	1987	San Diego (Town and Country)

NOTE: Prior to 1944, the annual Convention was held in December. No meeting was held in 1943, and commencing with 1944 the Convention has been held in January. The 1st and 2nd special Conventions were held in August. The 3rd special Convention was held immediately prior to the 70th Convention in January. The 4th special Convention was held in December. The 5th special Convention was held in June.

Appendix E

Past and Present Officers of the NCAA

Years	Name, Institution
President	
1906-1913	Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy
1914-1916	LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University
1917-1929	Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy
1930-1932	Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University
1933-1937	Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
1938-1940	William B. Owens, Stanford University
1941-1944	Phillip O. Badger, New York University
1945-1946	Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University, University of Wyoming
1947-1949	Karl E. Lieb, University of Iowa
1950-1952	Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California
1953-1954	Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa
1955-1956	Clarence P. Houston, Tufts College
1957-1958	Frank N. Gardner, Drake University
1959-1960	Herbert J. Dorricott, Western State College (Colorado)
1961-1962	Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University
1963-1964	Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa
1965-1966	Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
1967-1968	Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan
1969-1970	Harry M. Cross, University of Washington
1971-1972	Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
1973-1974	Alan J. Chapman, Rice University
1975-1976	John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University
1977-1978	J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas, Austin
1979-1980	William J. Flynn, Boston College
1981-1982	James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
1983-1984	John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
1985-1986	John R. Davis, Oregon State University
1987	— Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University
Secretary-Treasurer	
1906-1908	Louis A. Bevier Jr., Rutgers University, New Brunswick
1908	— William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia (Treasurer only)
1909-1939	Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University
1940-1944	Maj. John J. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
1945-1951	Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
1952-1954	Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
1955-1956	Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan
1957-1958	Edwin D. Mouzon Jr., Southern Methodist University
1959-1960	Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University
1961-1962	Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University
1963-1964	Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
1965-1966	Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines

1967-1968—Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University
 1969-1970—William J. Flynn, Boston College
 1971-1972—Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University, University of
 District of Columbia
 1973-1974—Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University
 1975-1976—Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University
 1977-1978—Edgar A. Sherman, Muskingum College
 1979-1980—James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
 1981-1982—John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
 1983-1984—John R. Davis, Oregon State University
 1985-1986—Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University
 1987 —Thomas J. Frericks, University of Dayton

Division I Vice-President

1983-1984—Gwendolyn Norrell, Michigan State University
 1985 —Arliss L. Roaden, Tennessee Technological University
 1986 —Lewis A. Cryer, Pacific Coast Athletic Association
 1987 —Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Division II Vice-President

1983 —Edwin W. Lawrence, University of Alaska, Fairbanks
 1984-1985—Ade L. Sponberg, North Dakota State University
 1986 —Asa N. Green, Livingston University
 1987 —Howard Elwell, Gannon University

Division III Vice-President

1983 —Kenneth J. Weller, Central College (Iowa)
 1984-1985—Elizabeth A. Kruczek, Fitchburg State College
 1986-1987—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego

Appendix F

Index to Legislative Proposals

The following index to the legislative proposals contained in this publication is offered for convenience of reference in locating amendments affecting certain portions of the Association's existing legislation. The left-hand listing is in the order in which the amendments would be placed in the NCAA Manual. The second column presents the proposal numbers in this publication that would affect each of the references in the left-hand column. The third column then lists the page numbers in this book on which those proposals appear.

<i>Legislative Reference</i>	<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>Page Numbers</i>
Constitution		
C 3-1-(e)-(4) [new]	No. 102	A-75
C 3-1-(g)-(1)	No. 44-A	A-27
C 3-1-(g)-(3)	Nos. 98-A, 100, 101	A-72, A-74, A-75
C 3-1-(h)-(7) [new]	Nos. 103, 104	A-76
C 3-2-(c)	Nos. 1, 60, 61	A-1, A-41
C 3-2-(g)	No. 50	A-34
C 3-4	No. 44-B	A-27
C 3-4-(d)-(2)-(iv)	No. 45	A-30
C 3-4-(d)-(3)	No. 97	A-71
C 3-6-(e)	No. 51	A-35
C 3-6-(i) [new]	No. 52	A-36
C 3-6-(j) [new]	No. 53	A-36
C 4-2-(a)-O.I. 11	No. 2	A-2
C 4-2-(h)-(3) [new]	No. 107	A-78
C 5-1-(g)	No. 139-A	A-99
C 5-2-(a)-(4) [new]	No. 3	A-3
C 5-2-(c)-(2)	Nos. 4, 59-A	A-3, A-40
C 5-2-(d)	No. 139-B	A-99
C 5-4-(d)-(8) [new]	No. 59-B	A-40
C 6-2	No. 5-A	A-3
C 6-2-(b) [new]	No. 142	A-101
C 7-2	No. 6-A	A-4
Bylaws		
B 1-1-(b)-(3)	Nos. 88, 89	A-65, A-66
B 1-2-(a)-(1)-(i)	No. 74	A-57
B 1-2-(a)-(1)-(ii)	Nos. 74, 75	A-57, A-58
B 1-2-(a)-(2) [new]	No. 76	A-58
B 1-2-(a)-(4)	No. 48-A	A-32
B 1-2-(a)-(5)	No. 49-A	A-33
B 1-2-(a)-(6)-(ii)	No. 77	A-59
B 1-2-(a)-(6)-(iii) [new]	No. 78	A-60
B 1-2-(a)-(6)-(vii) [new]	No. 79	A-60
B 1-2-(b)	No. 47	A-31
B 1-3-(a)	Nos. 49-B, 80	A-33, A-61
B 1-3-(b)	Nos. 48-B, 81, 82	A-32, A-61, A-62
B 1-3-(d) [new]	No. 83	A-62
B 1-6-(a) [new]	Nos. 91, 92	A-67, A-68

<i>Legislative Reference</i>	<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>Page Numbers</i>
B 1-6-(c)-(3)	No. 90	A-66
B 1-9-(b)	No. 84	A-63
B 1-9-(e)	No. 85	A-63
B 1-9-(f)	Nos. 86, 87	A-64
B 2-2-(g)	No. 144	A-104
B 2-3-(h)	No. 7	A-5
B 2-3-(j)	No. 8	A-6
B 2-4-(l)	No. 10	A-6
B 2-4-(m) [new]	No. 9	A-6
B 3-1-(d)	No. 130	A-94
B 3-2-(a)	No. 122-A	A-88
B 3-2-(b)-(5) [new]	No. 122-B	A-88
B 3-2-(c), (d), (e)	No. 122-C	A-89
B 3-2-(f) [old]	No. 122-D	A-89
B 3-3-(a)-(1)	Nos. 122-E, 128	A-90, A-93
B 3-3-(b)	Nos. 133, 134	A-95
B 3-3-(c)	Nos. 125, 129	A-91, A-93
B 3-3-(e), (f), (g)	No. 132	A-94
B 3-3-(h)	No. 124	A-91
B 3-3-(j)	No. 123	A-90
B 3-4-(b)	No. 127	A-92
B 3-6-(b)-(3)	No. 126	A-92
B 4-1-(b)-(1)	No. 11	A-7
B 4-1-(d) [new]	No. 98-B	A-72
B 4-1-(e) [new]	Nos. 98-C, 99	A-73, A-74
B 4-1-(f) [new]	No. 98-D	A-73
B 5-1-(c)	No. 12	A-7
B 5-1-(c)-(1)	No. 13	A-8
B 5-1-(d)	No. 145	A-105
B 5-1-(d)-(2)-(ii)	No. 146	A-106
B 5-1-(d)-(3)-O.I. 500	No. 147	A-106
B 5-1-(j)	Nos. 14, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69	A-8, A-44, A-48, A-51, A-53, A-56
B 5-1-(j)-(2)	No. 63	A-44
B 5-1-(j)-(6)-(ii)	Nos. 46, 71, 72	A-30, A-55, A-56
B 5-1-(j)-(6)-(iv) [new]	No. 70	A-55
B 5-1-(j)-(11)	No. 149	A-108
B 5-1-(j)-(11)-O.I. 501	No. 148	A-107
B 5-1-(m)-(8)	No. 150	A-108
B 5-1-(m)-(10)	No. 151	A-109
B 5-1-(m)-(14)	No. 152	A-110
B 5-6	No. 117	A-85
B 5-6-(e)	No. 62	A-42
B 5-6-(e)-(8) [new]	No. 73	A-57
B 5-7	No. 116	A-84
B 6-1 [new]	No. 44-C	A-27
B 6-5-(c)	No. 94	A-70
B 6-5-(d)	No. 96	A-71
B 6-5-(e)	No. 95	A-71
B 6-5-(i)	No. 93-B	A-69

<i>Legislative Reference</i>	<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>Page Numbers</i>
B 7-1-(a)	No. 135	A-97
B 7-1-(b)	Nos. 136, 138-A	A-97, A-98
B 7-1-(c)-(1)	No. 138-B	A-98
B 7-1-(e)	No. 137	A-98
B 7-1-(h)	No. 138-C	A-99
B 10-1-(f)-(3)	No. 111	A-80
B 10-3	No. 105	A-77
B 10-3-(b)	No. 106	A-78
B 10-3-(b)-(1), (2)	No. 121	A-88
B 10-6-(c)	Nos. 118, 119, 120	A-85, A-86, A-87
B 11-1-(b)	Nos. 15-A, 108	A-9, A-79
B 11-1-(d) [new]	No. 93-A	A-69
B 11-1-(g)-(1)	No. 16-A	A-10
B 11-1-(g)-(5)-(i)	No. 109	A-79
B 11-2-(b)	Nos. 15-B, 16-B, 17	A-9, A-10, A-11
B 11-3-(a)-(4)-(i)	No. 113	A-81
B 11-3-(b)	No. 15-C	A-9
B 11-4-(a)	No. 16-C	A-10
B 11-4-(b)	Nos. 16-D, 112-A	A-10, A-81
B 11-4-(b)-(2)	Nos. 16-E, 112-B	A-10, A-81
B 11-4-(b)-(6)	Nos. 16-F, 112-C	A-11, A-81
B 11-4-(b)-(7)	No. 110	A-80
B 12-3-(a)	No. 18	A-12
B 12-3-(b)	No. 19	A-12
B 12-3-(c) [old]	No. 20	A-12
B 12-3-(c) [new]	No. 21	A-13
B 12-3-(d) [old]	No. 26	A-16
B 12-3-(e)	No. 23	A-14
B 12-3-(f) [old]	No. 22	A-13
B 12-3-(h) [old]	No. 23	A-14
B 12-3-(i) and (1)	No. 24	A-15
B 12-3-(k) [old]	No. 30	A-18
B 12-3-(l) [old]	No. 30	A-18
B 12-3-(l) [new]	No. 25	A-15
B 12-3-(m) [old]	No. 28	A-17
B 12-3-(m) [new]	No. 26	A-16
B 12-3-(o) [old]	No. 27	A-16
B 12-3-(p) [old]	No. 29	A-17
B 12-3-(p) [new]	No. 5-B	A-3
B 12-3-(s) [old]	No. 30	A-18
B 12-3-(t)	No. 28	A-17
B 12-3-(u) [old]	No. 21	A-13
B 12-3-(x) [old]	No. 28	A-17
B 12-3-(x) [new]	No. 29	A-17
B 12-3-(y) [old]	Nos. 21, 31	A-13, A-18
B 12-3-(y) [new]	No. 30	A-18
B 12-3-(z) [old]	No. 26	A-16
B 12-3-(aa) [old]	No. 32	A-19
B 12-3-(bb) [new]	No. 33	A-19
B 12-4 [new]	No. 34	A-20
B 12-4-(a)-(4)	No. 35-A	A-21

<i>Legislative Reference</i>	<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>Page Numbers</i>
B 12-4-(e) [old]	No. 39	A-24
B 12-4-(g)	No. 36	A-22
B 12-4-(j)	No. 35-B	A-22
B 12-4-(m), (n)	No. 37	A-22
B 12-5-(a)-(1)	No. 38	A-23
B 12-5-(h)	No. 39	A-24
B 12-5-(m), (n)	No. 40	A-24
B 12-5-(s), (t)	No. 41	A-25
B 13-2	No. 6-B	A-5
Executive Regulations		
ER 1-1-(a)-(1)	No. 42	A-26
ER 1-3-(d)	No. 115	A-83
Recommended Policies		
Rec. Pol. 14 [new]	No. 43	A-26
Enforcement Procedure		
EP 2-(b)	No. 55	A-37
EP 5-(b)	No. 140	A-100
EP 6-(b)-(1)	No. 141	A-101
EP 12-(a)-(15)	No. 58	A-40
EP 12-(b)-(6)	No. 56	A-38
EP 12-(d)	No. 57	A-39
Resolutions		
Freshman Eligibility	No. 54	A-37
Drug Testing	No. 114	A-92
Interpretative Process	No. 143	A-103

[illegible]

U.S. AIR FORCE LIBRARY